

**SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS**

**DOCKET NO. 21000**

**PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

**TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1999**

**KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.**

**(512) 474-2233**

---

**KENNEDY**

---

**REPORTING**

---

**SERVICE**

---

*a record of excellence*

800 Brazos • Suite 340 • Austin, Texas 78701 • 512-474-2233

6 -HA

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF TEXAS

AUSTIN, TEXAS

INFORMAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FOR )  
ISSUES RELATING TO OPERATIONAL ) DOCKET NO.  
SUPPORT SYSTEMS ) 21000

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1999

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT AT 4:30 p.m., on

Tuesday, September 21st, 1999, the above-entitled

matter came on for hearing at the Public Utility

Commission of Texas, 1701 North Congress Avenue,

Austin, Texas 78701, before HOWARD SIEGEL,

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE; and the following

proceedings were reported by Lou Ray, a Certified

Shorthand Reporter of:

Page

1 Bourianoff, AT&T.

2 MR. COWLISHAW: Pat Cowlishaw

3 for AT&T.

4 MS. MULLIN: Sharon Mullin, AT&T.

5 MR. WITCHER: Mark Witcher, AT&T.

6 MR. BANNECKER: Bob Bannecker,

7 Southwestern Bell.

8 MS. MURRAY: Kelly Murray,

9 Southwestern Bell.

10 MR. BUCKWALTER: Garry

11 Buckwalter, Southwestern Bell.

12 MR. GORDON: Jerry Gordon,

13 Southwestern Bell.

14 MR. TRIMMIER: Gary Trimmier,

15 Southwestern Bell.

16 MR. HUGHES: Tom Hughes,

17 Southwestern Bell.

18 MR. COOPER: Charles Cooper,

19 Southwestern Bell.

20 MS. CONWAY: Candy Conway,

21 Southwestern Bell.

22 MS. DALTON: Nancy Dalton, AT&T.

23 MS. DeYOUNG: Sarah DeYoung,

24 AT&T. And Greg Terry was also here for AT&T but

25 left.

Page 2

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1999

3 (5:25 p.m.)

4 JUDGE SIEGEL: Let's go on the

5 record. We're putting a summary on the record

6 in Docket 21000, informal dispute resolution.

7 This informal dispute resolution focuses on

8 commercial issues relative to AT&T's commercial

9 entry.

10 For the record, my name is Howard

11 Siegel, and we're just going to go around and

12 get all the names on the record.

13 MR. HUDSON: Paul Hudson, PUC

14 Staff.

15 MS. HASSBROCK: Lisa Hassbrock,

16 AT&T.

17 MR. CRISSEY: Ken Crissey, AT&T.

18 MR. KETTELL: David Kettell,

19 AT&T.

20 MS. HALL: Lori Hall, AT&T.

21 MS. HEIMBACH: Rebecca Heimbach,

22 AT&T.

23 MS. LaVALLE: Kathleen LaValle

24 for AT&T.

25 MS. BOURIANOFF: Michelle

Page

1 JUDGE SIEGEL: I think next time

2 what we'll do is say the following people are

3 AT&T and then Southwestern Bell. Y'all feel

4 free to help fill in.

5 Paul, you want to lead off?

6 MR. HUDSON: Well, I've got a

7 series of action items I guess I can go ahead

8 and read off. My understanding is that Kathleen

9 and Kelly have also some items that they'd like

10 to put on the record as well. My understanding

11 is that there's a joint task force meeting

12 that's been set up between Southwestern Bell,

13 AT&T personnel at 11:00 a.m. on Wednesday.

14 And, Tom, if you could, go through

15 what that joint task force is going to go

16 through tomorrow and we'll get AT&T's assent to

17 that.

18 MR. HUGHES: Okay. Tom Hughes,

19 Southwestern Bell.

20 The joint task force will be initially

21 set up to look at issues associated with UNE

22 loop orders that were occurring from AT&T's Mesa

23 Center with our local operations and local

24 service center. The task force will be made up

25 of folks from the operation centers from both

Page 5

1 sides, as well as members from account teams on  
2 both sides.  
3 Their function will be to look at  
4 data. We're going to begin looking at August  
5 data and September data. There's also a  
6 movement from AT&T to look at July data  
7 potentially. The parties will work through that  
8 to determine if we should look through July  
9 data.  
10 We'll focus tomorrow and the  
11 discussion will start with September data. I  
12 believe AT&T will be providing us some August  
13 data potentially this week for the task force to  
14 review. What they will be looking at is for  
15 process improvements associated on both sides  
16 with the coordinated hot cut and the frame due  
17 time process, and then determining on a  
18 going-forward basis how those processes should  
19 be implemented.  
20 Today we also discussed adding to that  
21 task force looking at UNE-P and service outages  
22 associated with the UNE-P process. Southwestern  
23 Bell and AT&T both committed, I believe, to have  
24 somebody represented on that call tomorrow at  
25 11:00 to go through those issues and begin

Page 6

1 determining what specifically that task force  
2 end in mind shall be.  
3 MS. LaVALLE: This is Kathleen  
4 LaValle for AT&T.  
5 Charles, did you not commit that you  
6 would look at July data for UNE-L --  
7 MR. COOPER: Yes.  
8 MS. LaVALLE: -- issues?  
9 MR. HUDSON: The next action item  
10 I have --  
11 MS. DALTON: Can I supplement?  
12 MR. HUDSON: Please.  
13 MS. DALTON: Nancy Dalton, AT&T.  
14 For the UNE-P portion, we will have  
15 participating Lisa Hassbrock, Lori Hall, Phil  
16 Starks, Al Parrish and David Kettell. I think  
17 we agreed today that we would try to look at a  
18 comprehensive list of all AT&T outages to date  
19 from a UNE-P perspective covering loss of dial  
20 tone, loss of features, static or problems on  
21 the line, as well as loss of dialing or  
22 receiving capabilities would be a part of the  
23 task force.  
24 I believe that we agreed that we have  
25 a disagreement or have not yet been able to

Page 7

1 quantify mutually what the number of outages are  
2 to date. I think Southwestern Bell is quoting  
3 numbers on the no-dial-tone situation of less  
4 than 1 percent for August. We're looking at a  
5 3 percent no-dial-tone only for the month of  
6 August.  
7 We've committed that Lisa Hassbrock  
8 will work with Southwestern Bell to be the  
9 provider of all the detail we have so that we  
10 can, if nothing else, true-up and make sure  
11 we're accounting for all customers.  
12 In looking at the comprehensive list  
13 of tickets, I think we also agreed today that we  
14 would use, through the task force as a starting  
15 point, the examples on the multi-color matrix  
16 that we used for a lot of our discussion today  
17 to see if we can't get behind the root cause for  
18 the different categories I just described.  
19 I think we identified some root causes  
20 today having to do with how orders are generated  
21 and processed, be it the D, the N and the C  
22 order process and controversies in addresses,  
23 and we are not sure why there are controversies  
24 in addresses between pre-order systems, what we  
25 send on the LSR and what's in CRIS.

Page 8

1 We, AT&T, took an action item and  
2 we'll meet with Southwestern Bell with technical  
3 experts to describe how we are pulling  
4 information out of Datagate so we can try to  
5 figure out why there's a discrepancy between  
6 what we send on the LSR and what is then being  
7 pulled to create these orders and cause a  
8 situation where they're not related and  
9 situations where pairs are potentially being  
10 reassigned, which could, in fact, be one of the  
11 root causes behind service outages.  
12 JUDGE SIEGEL: Just so I know,  
13 for the task force, I know there's a number of  
14 people from both companies that are going to be  
15 on it, but, Tom, are you going to be the central  
16 contact point for that for Southwestern Bell?  
17 MR. HUGHES: The way it was set  
18 up initially, Howard, is Mark Van deWater, who  
19 is on Sarah's team and Bob Royer who is on my  
20 team will be the overseers. And James Ellis --  
21 and I'm not --  
22 UNIDEN. SPEAKER: Sheila  
23 Foster --  
24 MR. HUGHES: -- sure who from Mesa  
25 were really the working level coordinators. So

Page 9

1 the team today has evolved and has expanded to a  
2 larger --  
3 JUDGE SIEGEL: Do we need to add  
4 another overseer from AT&T that would be the  
5 UNE-P overseer?  
6 MS. DeYOUNG: Sarah DeYoung for  
7 AT&T.  
8 We ought to revisit that because when  
9 it was set up it was just looking at UNE loops  
10 and it was just the Mesa Center and now it's a  
11 little bit bigger in scope. So I would suggest  
12 that, Tom, you and Nancy and I would oversee  
13 that perhaps.  
14 MS. MURRAY: I guess my  
15 impression was some of these were not really  
16 task force issues, that they were issues to be  
17 dealt with by the account team through the  
18 regular -- I hate to establish a task force when  
19 we have a system in place to handle looking at  
20 these types of things going forward.  
21 It wasn't my understanding from the  
22 discussion earlier that all of those was going  
23 to be added to the task force that was designed  
24 for a specific purpose.  
25 MS. DALTON: My understanding was

Page 10

1 that --  
2 MS. MURRAY: I think these are --  
3 I'm sorry.  
4 MS. DALTON: -- on service outages  
5 where trouble tickets have been issued that root  
6 cause analysis would be done by a joint task  
7 force team between AT&T and Southwestern Bell.  
8 I thought there was concern that when  
9 Southwestern Bell looks at UNE outages, it's  
10 having trouble figuring out UNE-P versus UNE-L,  
11 and we agreed to bring forward the right  
12 resources by which to differentiate the two and  
13 provide the right level of information.  
14 MS. MURRAY: I don't --  
15 MR. BANNECKER: This is Bob  
16 Bannecker for Southwestern Bell.  
17 Hopefully what we're going to do,  
18 though, is issues relative to the pre-order,  
19 i.e., address validation stuff, those will work  
20 off-line -- those are really not what I  
21 understood to be the focus of this team was.  
22 They were going to look at these outages.  
23 If in fact the outages resulted from  
24 pre-order activity in terms of address  
25 validation or the input of the address, those we

Page 1

1 can work off-line. I hope that team is going to  
2 focus on more issues that involve true  
3 maintenance-type outages rather than activities  
4 associated with how the service was ordered.  
5 Because the ordering piece we can rectify up  
6 front. It will never get to that organization  
7 to work.  
8 MS. DALTON: I guess what I would  
9 be looking for is to the extent a trouble ticket  
10 is issued and it falls into the pot with a list  
11 of trouble tickets, if it's determined that the  
12 root cause has to do with address, there might  
13 be other people that then go off and figure out  
14 the address issue and work that particular  
15 issue.  
16 But I think the onus is on the  
17 technical team to determine the root cause of  
18 the outages first. I think we had a lot of  
19 suspicions today, as well as a lot of  
20 conclusions today around controversy as it is on  
21 this matrix and the address on the D, N, C  
22 orders as being one root cause.  
23 I think the team needs to look at --  
24 because the matrix, as I think Southwestern Bell  
25 agreed today, does not clearly identify what the

Page 1

1 root cause of the outages is and, therefore, I  
2 think we need to get at the root cause, identify  
3 and quantify what of those are a factor and by  
4 address controversy issues. I would agree with  
5 you then, Bob, a separate team can go figure out  
6 and work the pre-order and database type issues  
7 associated with why the address is different.  
8 But I think someone needs to come back  
9 first and determine that we do, in fact, have an  
10 address issue and that is in fact what's causing  
11 the service to go out.  
12 MS. LaVALLE: On the separate  
13 issue of service outage and getting behind and  
14 getting further detail on root cause analysis,  
15 to get a better explanation than we were able to  
16 review today on the multi-color matrix from  
17 Southwestern Bell, did Southwestern Bell not  
18 commit today that the task force would be  
19 expanded to include UNE-P orders for service  
20 outage? I thought we'd had a very specific  
21 discussion about that.  
22 MR. COOPER: This is Charles  
23 Cooper with Southwestern Bell.  
24 What I agreed to was to go back and  
25 look at that as far as a root cause analysis and

Page 13

1 include that in the task force if we deemed it  
2 necessary. What I committed to was to go back  
3 and look at July and August data and expand that  
4 to UNE-P is what I agreed to today. And that  
5 may or may not be part of the task force, but  
6 that was my commitment here today.  
7 MS. DALTON: I guess what --  
8 MR. HUGHES: Tom Hughes,  
9 Southwestern Bell.  
10 And, Nancy, the only concern I have --  
11 and, Sarah, the same -- I guess I don't want to  
12 hold this task force up to be the be all and end  
13 all when our teams work issues every day. I  
14 don't want to see everything get funneled into  
15 this task force because I think it will slow the  
16 process down.  
17 MS. DALTON: I would absolutely  
18 agree.  
19 MR. HUGHES: I think the address  
20 issue with Datagate and things like that, my  
21 personal opinion is we're going to work that  
22 one. If we want to make it part of the task  
23 force, I guess I'm not opposed to that. I just  
24 don't want to see us start lumping everything  
25 into this bucket and it becomes a big morass

Page 14

1 that we all get bogged down in, you know,  
2 keeping up with what's going on and it takes  
3 away from your team and my team doing what we do  
4 every day, and that is working issues.  
5 MS. DALTON: I don't think we  
6 disagree, Tom. I think I am, however, looking  
7 for the task force to take a comprehensive list  
8 of outages, identify trends and issues, and then  
9 from there we find the right forum to go work  
10 the particular issues. It's not to say that  
11 that task force that may in fact be comprised of  
12 a lot of technical maintenance-type people, I  
13 don't believe they'll have the wherewithal to  
14 work those particular issues. It's purely  
15 accepting the issues and identifying root cause.  
16 JUDGE SIEGEL: I think both sides  
17 were -- maybe a little gray -- are saying  
18 similar things. I think both of you don't want  
19 the task force to swallow up everything and slow  
20 things down. There's agreement on that.  
21 If there's some gray that becomes a  
22 problem, let us know. But I think -- as you get  
23 the specifics, I think, from what I'm hearing,  
24 there will be a general consensus over what  
25 belongs and what doesn't.

Page 15

1 MS. LaVALLE: We also heard, in  
2 addition to the task force idea, I believe, what  
3 was a commitment from Southwestern Bell to  
4 provide more specific information in response,  
5 for example, to trouble tickets, so that when an  
6 issue closes we will have a more detailed  
7 explanation. AT&T had expressed its concern  
8 that the information coming back in response to  
9 trouble tickets did not appear to agree with the  
10 further information that was provided back by  
11 Southwestern Bell when we tried to escalate the  
12 issues through the account team.  
13 Is that a fair summary?  
14 MR. HUGHES: I think so.  
15 MR. HUDSON: Okay. Let's keep  
16 going on this list. My understanding is that  
17 Southwestern Bell committed to provide a more  
18 recent MOG eligibility list to AT&T as an action  
19 item? I think that was Gary Trimmer --  
20 MR. HUGHES: That's correct.  
21 MS. DALTON: Is that available  
22 today?  
23 MR. TRIMMIER: Yes.  
24 MR. HUDSON: Can we have a  
25 commitment date for --

Page 16

1 MR. HUGHES: We'll get it to you  
2 tomorrow, Nancy and Sarah both.  
3 MS. DALTON: Thank you.  
4 MR. HUDSON: We also need a  
5 committed date from Southwestern Bell as to  
6 deciding whether an edit should be added or  
7 whether a change in Datagate procedures would be  
8 available for a particular issue that we  
9 discussed which I don't have in my notes.  
10 MR. HUGHES: This is Tom Hughes,  
11 Southwestern Bell.  
12 We discussed an issue around the D, N  
13 & C orders in particular having different  
14 addresses on it and the root cause of how that  
15 address was being populated by AT&T. Was it an  
16 issue of the Datagate data versus something that  
17 Southwestern Bell's system that may have caused  
18 the different addresses?  
19 What we've agreed to do is provide  
20 AT&T with our analysis of that so they could  
21 look at it and determine what they saw if they  
22 could. Some of the data may be dated to see if  
23 they could determine what they saw in Datagate.  
24 Then after we determine if it was an  
25 issue of they pulled something out of Datagate

Page 17

1 that we gave them or they, for some reason, put  
2 an address on the order that our system didn't  
3 recognize. Then we would look at what was the  
4 best way to resolve the issue, is it a Datagate  
5 issue or something we need to edit for through  
6 the MOG to make sure those fall out so end users  
7 don't become negatively impacted --  
8 MS. DALTON: Yeah, I would agree  
9 with that. We did talk about the fact that  
10 there's some edits that have been put in place  
11 in the Pacific company around addressees, and we  
12 didn't conclude that that would be something we  
13 would do here, but we said we would conclude  
14 what to do to resolve the issue after we have  
15 done the analysis that Tom just described.  
16 MS. LaVALLE: We didn't conclude  
17 to the extent that Southwestern Bell didn't  
18 agree today to provide that kind of an edit.  
19 MS. DALTON: Right.  
20 MR. HUDSON: Do you-all want to  
21 put a date on the record where you-all will try  
22 to touch base on when all of this is going to  
23 take place?  
24 MR. HUGHES: It would be my  
25 thought -- Nancy, David, jump in -- we've got a

Page 18

1 meeting scheduled for next Wednesday. I  
2 envision getting them some data tomorrow, them  
3 doing their analysis and, hopefully, being able  
4 to get it back to us so we can have some time to  
5 try to determine what happened before the 29th;  
6 or, if not, we can discuss it on the 29th and  
7 then we'll set a date there that would agreeable  
8 to us as to when we could resolve the issue.  
9 MS. DALTON: I would agree with  
10 that.  
11 MR. HUDSON: Some additional  
12 items here -- again I was scrawling here -- AT&T  
13 to highlight AIN trigger outages for  
14 Southwestern Bell Telephone to research. I  
15 think you may have alluded to that already,  
16 Nancy.  
17 MS. DALTON: We did have outages  
18 as a result of the AIN trigger process. It was  
19 a manual process that was mechanized by  
20 Southwestern Bell in July. We have a concern  
21 that we have seen additional instances of that  
22 since -- actually, August 15th, excuse me.  
23 We've seen additional instances since August  
24 15th. We provided examples to Tom, examples  
25 that are not specific to resale UNE-P

Page

1 conversion, to determine whether or not it's the  
2 same problem or not. The customer experience is  
3 the same, but we don't know if the root cause is  
4 the same.  
5 MR. HUGHES: And Southwestern  
6 Bell, we'll review the list and determine if  
7 it's a similar issue or if there are other  
8 factors that may have led to that.  
9 MS. LaVALLE: At this point,  
10 though, we at least have confirmation that  
11 Southwestern Bell has seen, post August 15, I  
12 believe you cited a couple of examples, where it  
13 looked like what was an AIN issue in terms of  
14 setting the triggers.  
15 MR. HUGHES: I don't know that I  
16 would say it's an AIN issue -- and, Charles, you  
17 can correct me. I think we have cited or you  
18 have cited to us examples where the customer has  
19 not been able to place a call, and that may or  
20 may not be related to the AIN issue.  
21 MS. LaVALLE: And I thought  
22 Charles said he had seen at least two examples  
23 that looked to be AIN related post --  
24 MR. COOPER: Well, you know, let  
25 me -- this is Charles Cooper, excuse me.

Page 2

1 Yes, I did say that. I also said I  
2 need to go back and look at this list and follow  
3 this order to see if it was definitely AIN  
4 problems or not.  
5 MS. DALTON: Okay.  
6 MR. HUDSON: Along those same  
7 lines, I have Southwestern Bell committed to  
8 looking at line class code and AIN trigger  
9 investigations one week from Wednesday.  
10 MR. HUGHES: Yes.  
11 MR. HUDSON: In addition, I have  
12 an action item, I believe, for Southwestern Bell  
13 for the next meeting about whether they can  
14 provide a list of the RCMAC list of manual  
15 handling.  
16 MR. HUGHES: This is Tom Hughes,  
17 Southwestern Bell.  
18 Are you saying we took an action item  
19 to provide a list of all instances where RCMAC  
20 remain in the handling order?  
21 MR. HUDSON: I don't have it  
22 listed as "all" in my notes here. So if other  
23 people can refresh...  
24 MS. LaVALLE: "A description of  
25 all manual fallout that are MAC reasons for

Page 21

1 manual intervention."  
2 MR. HUGHES: My recollection was  
3 we were going to provide you a couple of  
4 examples of when an order may fall out to the  
5 RCMAC, and then in further discussion we  
6 actually covered some. Charles mentioned LTG  
7 and we got onto a discussion about line  
8 class codes.  
9 JUDGE SIEGEL: Can we say  
10 something like X number of the most -- the most  
11 often or the top six list or something in terms  
12 of volume? I mean, can we --  
13 MR. HUGHES: I can't commit to  
14 that because I don't know that such a list  
15 exists. I don't know that one doesn't exist; I  
16 just don't know that one exists. I thought what  
17 we had agreed to provide was examples.  
18 JUDGE SIEGEL: Let's see what you  
19 can do.  
20 MR. HUDSON: The next action item  
21 I have written down is I believe Southwestern  
22 Bell was going to go back and look at whether  
23 plans are in place for regression testing  
24 specifically related to changes in CRIS.  
25 MR. HUGHES: Right. That was

Page 22

1 specifically directed really, Nancy, at two  
2 issues, the issue of Southwestern Bell sending a  
3 final bill when a resold customer converted to  
4 UNE-P, we sent a final bill with zero due  
5 balance to some AT&T end users.  
6 We put a fix in place in July to  
7 ensure that didn't happen and you asked that we  
8 go back and ensure when we do further CRIS  
9 updates that that particular fix does not become  
10 undone.  
11 And then an issue associated with  
12 collect calls to some of our records that we  
13 were passing back and forth, we put a fix in  
14 place to correct those and Nancy asked that we  
15 make sure on a regression basis that when we do  
16 things in CRIS this fix is not undone. We  
17 agreed to go back and talk to our folks.  
18 MS. DALTON: I agree with that.  
19 MS. LaVALLE: I believe we also  
20 had an open question as to whether or not the  
21 CRIS data base is updated because of  
22 inaccuracies in a customer record in CRIS,  
23 whether or not Southwestern Bell had in place a  
24 process by which it would go back to the  
25 original premise database and square up those

Page 23

1 corrections. And I believe they represented  
2 that both CRIS and --  
3 JUDGE SIEGEL: Datagate --  
4 MS. LaVALLE: -- Datagate were  
5 sourced through PREMISE.  
6 MR. HUGHES: Subject to check.  
7 JUDGE SIEGEL: I think part of  
8 that was that you don't actually do a change in  
9 CRIS. You would do the change in PREMISE and  
10 that would just automatically feed forward.  
11 MR. HUGHES: That's correct.  
12 MS. LaVALLE: And the question  
13 was relative both to where you were doing that  
14 because of a directory listing kind of record  
15 update, or a pending 9-0-1, 9-1-1 record update  
16 through accuracy checks.  
17 JUDGE SIEGEL: That was also  
18 related to the N order that had those  
19 activities.  
20 MR. HUDSON: The next action item  
21 I have is related to post SOC outages. I  
22 believe Southwest Bell cited some examples where  
23 they said that it could be because addresses are  
24 unrelated and the D order is being worked after  
25 the C order. They agreed to work through some

Page 24

1 root cause analysis of July examples.  
2 MS. DALTON: We provided Tom July  
3 examples and one September example of where we  
4 suspect that work was done after the service  
5 order completion was actually reported to be  
6 complete.  
7 JUDGE SIEGEL: One thought that I  
8 had, we spent a lot of time today talking about  
9 D, N & C and how things flow. I was thinking  
10 maybe it would be a good idea for Nancy or David  
11 or Lori to take as an action item to put down  
12 their understanding of that discussion on a  
13 piece of paper. And then in one of our future  
14 meetings Southwestern Bell will say, "Yes, you  
15 got it right," or "no" and that probably would  
16 actually be more effective than actually  
17 Southwestern Bell putting it down on paper.  
18 And since, Nancy, as you said, that  
19 your understanding of how those things work was  
20 better after today and we can make sure that  
21 when this process is done that it's -- that  
22 you're comfortable that your understanding is in  
23 fact the right understanding.  
24 MS. DALTON: We can do one of two  
25 things. We can try to summarize that now, or I

Page 25

1 can take the action item to put it on a piece of  
2 paper. I think today was very productive from  
3 my perspective, and I thank Southwestern Bell  
4 for sharing the information they did today. I  
5 think today is a starting point.  
6 I can't say that I know everything  
7 about the D, the C and the N, and I can't say  
8 that I will get it all right. But I think it  
9 would be a good exercise for us to put it down,  
10 share it with Southwestern Bell, ask for  
11 validation and use that as the point by which we  
12 have future discussion about commercial issues  
13 and try to pinpoint on that flow, you know,  
14 well, what within this flow or where within this  
15 flow did XYZ issue occur and what caused it. I  
16 think we can use that to then flesh it out in  
17 further detail if that's agreeable to  
18 Southwestern Bell.  
19 JUDGE SIEGEL: I think the  
20 advantage of doing it on paper is, one, you can  
21 do it as a group. Two, like you said, as you're  
22 going through it, you'll probably realize that  
23 "Oops, there's a gap there and I didn't realize  
24 there was a gap there." And, you know, by the  
25 next meeting we'll actually have, hopefully, a

Page 26

1 fully comprehensive --  
2 MS. DALTON: It's just always  
3 dangerous to be documenting someone else's  
4 systems and processes. So I would just ask  
5 Southwestern Bell to endure and realize that  
6 we're working from the knowledge we have on the  
7 board today.  
8 JUDGE SIEGEL: And I'm sure --  
9 MR. HUGHES: We'll work with you.  
10 JUDGE SIEGEL: -- Tom will help  
11 you answer your questions as you do.  
12 MR. HUGHES: Give me a call.  
13 MS. DALTON: The 29th we'll have  
14 a draft.  
15 MR. HUGHES: I don't know that  
16 I'll know the answer.  
17 MR. HUDSON: The next item I have  
18 is for AT&T. It's my understanding that they  
19 haven't encountered any additional examples of  
20 the installer leaving behind materials that  
21 indicated Southwestern Bell or making a sales  
22 pitch, so to speak. They were going to be sure  
23 and report back to Southwestern Bell the  
24 specific time and/or address that that happened  
25 or if it happened again so that Southwestern

Page

1 Bell can take some corrective actions.  
2 MS. DALTON: Correct.  
3 MR. HUDSON: The next item I have  
4 here is that Southwestern Bell is going to take  
5 the action item to see whether there's been an  
6 update to an accessible letter on EDI  
7 availability issues.  
8 MR. HUGHES: That's correct.  
9 MR. HUDSON: The next action item  
10 I have is -- I think this one is for Charles --  
11 they're going to check through kind of a  
12 quantification to true-up with different  
13 accounts where AT&T and Southwestern Bell  
14 varies. I believe that Nancy indicated that  
15 Lisa will be the person that Charles will be  
16 trueing up these numbers with.  
17 MS. DALTON: Correct.  
18 MR. HUDSON: The next one I have  
19 in my notes is for Rebecca. She was going to be  
20 responsible for seeing if her agents were  
21 receiving updated problem codes from  
22 Southwestern Bell on, I think, wiring specific  
23 problems was what we were addressing at the  
24 time.  
25 MS. LaVALLE: Paul, before we go

Page 2

1 to UNE-L, could you -- are you finished?  
2 MR. HUDSON: Yes. I'm sure you  
3 have plenty.  
4 MS. LaVALLE: I just had a couple  
5 more. I believe we had a commitment from  
6 Southwestern Bell that they would try to pull  
7 some examples of orders that didn't post -- that  
8 don't post?  
9 MS. DALTON: Correct.  
10 MS. LaVALLE: Trying to get a  
11 better idea of the occurrence and the kind of  
12 issue that causes posting problems.  
13 Also we had asked the question whether  
14 they could identify a range of time it takes for  
15 an order to post and complete that posting  
16 process in the CLEC world versus the retail  
17 environment. And at least I didn't hear the  
18 question answered in this meeting and would ask  
19 that that would be an item that Southwestern  
20 Bell agreed to report on.  
21 Go ahead, Nancy.  
22 MS. DALTON: I had two additional  
23 items. One had to do with the root cause  
24 analysis, and there was a specific item that we  
25 talked about on the matrix, the last item on

Page 29

1 Page 1, where it appears that the reason for an  
2 outage is as a result of moving facilities off  
3 of integrated pair gains. Charles recognized  
4 that what's on the matrix might not in fact be  
5 true root cause. And that's where additional  
6 root cause analysis has come in, the fear being  
7 that from a UNE-L perspective things are moved  
8 off of an integrated pair gain to copper and, in  
9 fact, the same thing might have been put in  
10 place for UNE-P or not, but that was one action  
11 item that I think was specifically agreed to  
12 look at in the range of group cause of outages.

13 JUDGE SIEGEL: Is this the same  
14 as IDLC or is this something else?

15 MS. DALTON: I'm afraid so.

16 MR. COOPER: No, it's actually  
17 integrated SLC where you have a field  
18 (inaudible) talking directly to the central  
19 office and you can't physically move that to  
20 collocate. What I'm going to do is verify does  
21 that apply to UNE-P also or is that a misnumber  
22 all the time.

23 MS. LaVALLE: Would you look also  
24 at the IDLC issue to see if there's any movement  
25 of the -- off of the IDLC --

Page 30

1 MR. COOPER: What are you --  
2 MS. LaVALLE: -- in the UNE-P  
3 environment? Because that could obviously also  
4 involve touching the facilities and might raise  
5 the occurrence or potential for service outage.

6 MR. COOPER: I'm not sure I  
7 understand the question. What is IDLC?

8 JUDGE SIEGEL: Integrated digital  
9 loop carrier. For UNE-L I know that you get  
10 moved off of the integrated digital onto  
11 universal. And I know that was the policy for  
12 UNE-P, I believe, at a time. I actually don't  
13 remember what the Commission ended up doing in  
14 16251. I don't think they addressed it one way  
15 or the other. I don't remember how it got  
16 addressed.

17 MR. COOPER: There's several  
18 things we're looking at, and one of them is SLC  
19 one, mini flicks, we believe that may cause some  
20 problems. But what I've asked my team to look  
21 at is all the different scenarios of SLC and  
22 does it apply to UNE-P? Is there any provisions  
23 or reason we can't use that.

24 MS. DALTON: I think the last  
25 item, Paul, that I have on UNE-P has to do with

Page 31

1 the -- I think we already had this commitment  
2 and that is the conflict between toll block and  
3 customized routing, and that by the end of the  
4 month the non-5E switches will have been  
5 validated and any for which 0+ calls or zero  
6 dialed calls are still routed when toll block is  
7 requested will be modified so as not to route  
8 that. The 5E should be the only switch that has  
9 that occurrence following the end of this month.

10 MR. HUGHES: That's correct.

11 MS. LaVALLE: One last question  
12 on the rural addresses, Nancy, we asked the  
13 question how would EASE handle those addresses,  
14 and I don't think the folks here were able to  
15 give us a response. Is Southwestern Bell  
16 willing to provide us a response to that  
17 question, give us a comparable understanding on  
18 the retail side of what these unnamed,  
19 unspecified, unnumbered addresses, how those are  
20 processed within EASE?

21 MS. MURRAY: I think that what we  
22 talked about was how were the rural addresses --  
23 I think that Gerri gave a presentation on how  
24 the rural addresses are handled through EDI.  
25 And so then the issue was are they handled

Page 32

1 comparably on the retail side and we will check  
2 that out for you.

3 MS. LaVALLE: Okay.

4 MR. HUDSON: Is that all,  
5 Kathleen and Nancy, for now?

6 MS. DALTON: Lori, do you have  
7 any other action items?

8 MS. LaVALLE: No, she's given me  
9 a list.

10 MS. DALTON: I seem to have got  
11 at least what I had in my notes is all.

12 MR. HUDSON: Okay. The next item  
13 I have down --

14 MS. LaVALLE: And this is  
15 probably redundant, Paul, but Southwestern Bell  
16 had agreed to further investigate what would be  
17 common causes, as that phrase was used on their  
18 matrix, common causes for problems with UNE  
19 conversions, and to give us a better  
20 understanding what "business as usual" meant,  
21 and with the suggestion that probably that  
22 phrase may have been used perhaps not with  
23 precision in at least the working draft.

24 JUDGE SIEGEL: Because it was an  
25 internal document.

Page 33

1 MS. LaVALLE: And that we may  
2 need to have a further explanation of what  
3 "business as usual" means and whether or not  
4 those are really specific to conversions or just  
5 a better understanding of what that means.  
6 MR. HUDSON: The next additional  
7 action item I have is for Sarah and Rebecca. It  
8 is a go-back discussion of whether you were  
9 willing to continue with some frame due date  
10 time testing.  
11 MS. DeYOUNG: I guess -- this is  
12 Sarah DeYoung for AT&T. I think that was  
13 dependent on us sitting down and doing a  
14 detailed process flow on the FDT process and  
15 working through the issues that we saw with that  
16 process, and also looking at ways to test the  
17 process without putting additional live  
18 customers at risk.  
19 I don't think it's as simple as us  
20 just going back and deciding --  
21 MR. HUDSON: Okay. Well, the  
22 next one was action item for computing a flow  
23 for FDT, and so I assume that all three of those  
24 items will take place kind of in parallel.  
25 MS. DeYOUNG: Right. And again,

Page 34

1 AT&T's decision will be based on us being able  
2 to agree that a process was in place that would  
3 address the problems that we saw in a previous  
4 trial and also resulted in no outages for  
5 customers.  
6 MR. HUDSON: The very last action  
7 item I have -- and I'm sure there are more --  
8 is that Tom and Candy would go back and see if  
9 the process change for Issue No. 14 is similar  
10 across all CLECs and not AT&T specific.  
11 MR. HUGHES: Correct.  
12 MS. LaVALLE: And that would have  
13 been whether or not Southwestern Bell is using  
14 invalid due date code to reject an order when it  
15 can't meet a requested due date rather than a  
16 process that was agreed to use with AT&T where  
17 it would instead provide FOC with an alternative  
18 confirm due date.  
19 MR. HUGHES: The only thing I  
20 would say there is I don't know that we agree  
21 that's an invalid reject, but I think that's an  
22 issue that we've discussed.  
23 JUDGE SIEGEL: Okay.  
24 MS. DeYOUNG: We agree to  
25 disagree, I guess, on that.

Page

1 JUDGE SIEGEL: But the production  
2 world keeps moving on.  
3 MR. HUDSON: Do you have action  
4 items on your list?  
5 JUDGE SIEGEL: Most of mine I'm  
6 sure were TM related, so...  
7 MS. DeYOUNG: Okay. We had  
8 discussion about cancellation of orders by  
9 Southwestern Bell. I believe we had agreement  
10 that -- well, AT&T provided examples, additional  
11 examples of when that had occurred. And we  
12 learned of those on the day of the cut.  
13 We also are going to look at that  
14 and -- I don't want to use the task force.  
15 We're going to look at that, we're going to work  
16 that issue between us and try to -- because AT&T  
17 still does not understand why that would ever  
18 occur. So we need examples, and I believe that  
19 Southwestern Bell agreed to provide examples of  
20 why they would ever need to cancel and reissue  
21 the C order on their side.  
22 JUDGE SIEGEL: And I think the  
23 two commitments Southwestern Bell made on that  
24 was, one, to try to do that only when necessary  
25 and, two, that when they do do it, to make sure

Page

1 they're proactive in informing AT&T when that's  
2 done so they can be tracking.  
3 MS. CONWAY: That's correct.  
4 This is Candy Conway.  
5 AT&T gave us a list today of orders  
6 that were canceled on day of cut and we're going  
7 to investigate those.  
8 JUDGE SIEGEL: And just to be  
9 clear, if I remember, it's not necessarily that  
10 they were canceled on the day of the cut, it was  
11 on the day of the cut that they learned that  
12 they were canceled.  
13 MS. DeYOUNG: Right. We also  
14 discussed a continuing problem where AT&T is  
15 receiving requests from either the LOC or the  
16 LSC to supp an order when Southwestern Bell  
17 cannot meet the due date. AT&T requested that  
18 some sort of notification both in the LOC and in  
19 the LSC be made to clarify that that is not  
20 Southwestern Bell's policy -- I understand that  
21 it's not Southwestern Bell's policy to do  
22 that -- and to communicate back to AT&T that  
23 that retraining, if you will, had taken place.  
24 Do you agree that that was --  
25 MR. HUGHES: Yes.

Page 37

1 JUDGE SIEGEL: And you stated  
2 that it was currently taking place on average  
3 about two --  
4 MS. DeYOUNG: Two to three times  
5 per week since May.  
6 Oh, right. And that further on that,  
7 that we agreed that the correct process is that  
8 Southwestern Bell should be issuing a jeopardy  
9 notice on that order, which would then count  
10 against the applicable performance measures.  
11 MR. BANNECKER: This is Bob  
12 Bannecker, Southwestern Bell.  
13 One point I want to clarify relative  
14 to the issue about the request for supps and if  
15 in fact that's happening two or three times a  
16 week -- and I'm assuming based upon what Rebecca  
17 said earlier that y'all are referring them to  
18 managers -- that needs to be brought up on these  
19 weekly calls to make sure every one is apprised.  
20 Because that's -- at least Candy and I, that's  
21 kind of the first time we've heard of that. So  
22 we need to make sure those are being addressed  
23 on these operational calls where we're all aware  
24 that that continues and we can take corrective  
25 actions to make sure it stops.

Page 38

1 MS. DeYOUNG: And AT&T agrees we  
2 need to do that.  
3 JUDGE SIEGEL: And just to make  
4 it clear, it's not that it was the first time  
5 you've heard that issue, Bob, it was the first  
6 time you heard it was happening that regularly.  
7 MS. CONWAY: Correct.  
8 MS. DeYOUNG: We had an agreement  
9 from Southwestern Bell that when we ask for a  
10 dispatch they will dispatch. Similarly, we  
11 have -- I think this came up in UNE-P -- an  
12 agreement that the LOC will not deflect to the  
13 LSC when there are issues that between them;  
14 that they will take accountability for the  
15 problem and get back to us with resolution.  
16 MS. LaVALLE: Kathleen LaValle  
17 for AT&T.  
18 We raised the question, at least in  
19 this group, (inaudible) on some performance  
20 measure issues that it did not appear to AT&T --  
21 and I didn't hear any contrary statement by  
22 Southwestern Bell -- that the service outage  
23 issues that are provisioning problems are  
24 appearing in any of the performance measures  
25 data reported in its existing state. There were

Page 39

1 other performance measures issues raised, in  
2 particular --  
3 MS. MURRAY: On that one,  
4 Kathleen, could I --  
5 MS. LaVALLE: Sure.  
6 MS. MURRAY: Kelly Murray,  
7 Southwestern Bell.  
8 We've repeatedly stated during the  
9 course of the hearing today we did not have  
10 performance measurement SMEs available to  
11 comment on the performance measurement questions  
12 that AT&T is raising. So while there may not  
13 have been statements to the contrary, it's  
14 simply because we don't have the people here  
15 that are prepared to respond to the issue.  
16 JUDGE SIEGEL: Well, I tell you,  
17 let me run through some performance measures  
18 questions that came up that the group is going  
19 to be working with. And I'll say  
20 questions/concerns. Some of these I don't know  
21 if they're questions as much as just concerns.  
22 A concern that frame due time may not  
23 be covered by the existing performance measures.  
24 Concern that provisioning difficulties during  
25 the provisioning process on UNE loop cutovers

Page 40

1 may not be covered; that Performance Measure 115  
2 may be time stamped off of the start of a  
3 cutover rather than the finish time. A concern  
4 that the provisioning interval for loop with  
5 number portability orders may -- has a deadline  
6 based on a provisioning interval following FOC  
7 rather than LSR time.  
8 A query relating to an interim method  
9 that was put into place pending an October 23rd  
10 fix concerning performance measures and  
11 provisioning and how to get orders in on the  
12 three-day provisioning interval -- proposed  
13 three-day interval and how those -- that data  
14 may or may not be getting into the broader  
15 reported data. Query as to when CLECs in the  
16 past were requested to supp an order, how  
17 those -- supp an order rather than a due date  
18 being missed, how that may or may not be  
19 reflected in June and July performance data.  
20 A question relating to when an LSR is  
21 not able to receive an FOC with the standard  
22 interval and how that may or may not be impacted  
23 or read in the performance measures.  
24 And then just some general questions  
25 that hopefully will -- the parties will be able

Page 41

1 to discuss in the coming week or two, probably  
2 week, just trying to get an understanding as to  
3 how AT&T's reported data comports with how it is  
4 seeing service. I think this was particularly  
5 focused on UNE-L issues.  
6 Relating to UNE-P, AT&T has some  
7 questions and/or concerns relating to capturing  
8 of trouble tickets, particularly historically  
9 when manual trouble ticket requests were being  
10 forwarded to the local service center rather  
11 than the local operations center.  
12 And just some further discussion  
13 relating to issues when an order is rejected  
14 improperly and whether -- and/or how that may or  
15 may not be reflected in the existing performance  
16 measures.  
17 Anything additional?  
18 MR. COWLISHAW: Yeah, Pat  
19 Cowlshaw.  
20 On measure -- what you recited about  
21 Measure 115, it had been my understanding that  
22 Southwestern Bell had confirmed during our  
23 meeting today that both 114 and 115, premature  
24 disconnects and delayed cuts, were based on the  
25 start time that is reported by a Southwestern

Page 42

1 Bell technician on a manual log so that that 115  
2 is capturing late starts and not late  
3 completions. I thought we were actually able to  
4 clarify that point and I hope I'm correct. I  
5 think it was Candy that had that understanding.  
6 MS. CONWAY: Yeah, I shook my  
7 head yes.  
8 MR. COWLISHAW: And so the  
9 question that then is open for AT&T on that one  
10 is, is there -- we think the answer is no --  
11 anywhere that the measures are capturing the  
12 amount of time that it takes from the start of  
13 the cut to the end of the cut. And all of those  
14 issues that you have summarized, most of them,  
15 in close to so many words, I think, were set out  
16 in the commercial activity filing. We had come  
17 prepared and hoped to discuss from AT&T's  
18 standpoint today, mindful of the fact the  
19 Commission has said or Staff has said the  
20 Commission may take up Version 1.6 at the Open  
21 Meeting on Thursday -- we were notified late  
22 yesterday afternoon that Southwestern Bell would  
23 not bring its performance measure SMEs to this  
24 meeting. We have set up a procedure for having  
25 some further discussions on this subject next

Page

1 week.  
2 It remains AT&T's serious concern that  
3 both comments on the data collection process  
4 document and on these perceived gaps between our  
5 commercial experience and what's coming off of  
6 the performance measures be understood and  
7 addressed before any decisions are made about  
8 the business rules because we believe some of  
9 them, particularly this gap on the UNE-L issue,  
10 are 271 affecting, reference Paragraph 283 of  
11 the BellSouth Second Louisiana --  
12 MS. MURRAY: Just a brief reply  
13 to that. Southwestern Bell in its reply  
14 comments to AT&T's matrix pointed out the  
15 performance measurements are being dealt with in  
16 Docket 16251 in a number of different processes  
17 and proceedings and meetings, comments filed,  
18 et cetera. So we viewed the performance measure  
19 issues as being handled over there sufficiently  
20 such that discussing them in this forum wouldn't  
21 be useful.  
22 And also, as was pointed out in later  
23 discussion, the issue of commercial activity and  
24 the impact of commercial activity on performance  
25 measurements is something that's going to be

Page

1 changing, moving, in a lot of respects is a  
2 moving target. So that is part of the reason  
3 why there's the six-month review of the  
4 performance measurements --  
5 MS. LaVALLE: This is Kathleen  
6 LaValle for AT&T. It's our inability to  
7 understand it today in terms of how the  
8 commercial activity is collected in performance  
9 measures that led us to request that those  
10 topics be discussed today.  
11 Just two points of clarification on  
12 performance measures, one on the framed due day  
13 time, whether or not those processes were  
14 captured in the performance measures. It's  
15 really two issues. Some say it's not  
16 disaggregated. In other instances Southwestern  
17 Bell in its comments has specifically said that  
18 it is excluding frame due date time from  
19 particular categories.  
20 And then on the -- whether or not the  
21 four-day interim process where AT&T cannot ask  
22 for a UNE-L completion on a three-day interval  
23 until the October release, the specific issue is  
24 whether or not Southwestern Bell will agree to  
25 post the data in the ordinary course on its

Page 45

1 website or whether it will instead use this  
2 process it has proposed, which is an e-mail of a  
3 special report wherein it would include those  
4 four-day requests in measures that would  
5 otherwise exclude those four-day requests  
6 because they would not fit the definition of the  
7 standard interval request.  
8 I understand Southwestern Bell has  
9 agreed to see if they can seek acceptance of  
10 honoring AT&T's request that would be posted as  
11 other performance data is made available.  
12 Other issues that -- besides the  
13 performance measures issues raised, we did have  
14 a detailed discussion about AT&T and its trial  
15 frame due date process with Southwestern Bell. I  
16 think the parties came to an agreement that the  
17 trial, obviously, did not go as well as we had  
18 hoped.  
19 JUDGE SIEGEL: Would you be  
20 prepared to say that it worked well in Dallas,  
21 did not work well in Houston?  
22 MS. LaVALLE: I think that you  
23 have to look at it has a whole. We had 9 out of  
24 17 orders, you know, experience a service  
25 outage, so I don't think we're prepared to say

Page 46

1 anything more than it appeared that Houston was  
2 a larger problem than Dallas was.  
3 We tried to get at the maturity of the  
4 frame due date process when the issue of one  
5 city versus another or two particular COs in  
6 Houston was raised. As I understand it,  
7 Southwestern Bell was not able to tell us what  
8 percentage of the central offices in Texas today  
9 have experienced or been through the process of  
10 frame due date time processing.  
11 Southwestern Bell did report there was  
12 one other CLEC in Texas during frame due date  
13 time. We asked but did not get a response in  
14 terms of what the volume of frame due date time  
15 processing is except that -- I think I  
16 understood, Charles, you said, that it was not  
17 even 50 percent of total activity for UNE-L  
18 orders with local number portability. Did I get  
19 that right?  
20 MR. COOPER: In reference to  
21 what, Kathleen?  
22 MS. LaVALLE: I had asked how  
23 often and at what volume frame due date time  
24 orders were being process. I thought you had  
25 said -- please correct me if I got it wrong --

Page 47

1 that it was not happening even 50 percent of the  
2 time.  
3 MR. COOPER: With that particular  
4 CLEC?  
5 MS. LaVALLE: Oh, I guess I  
6 thought I was asking in terms of the total  
7 volume of UNE-L.  
8 JUDGE SIEGEL: I think it was  
9 total volume.  
10 MR. COOPER: That's a true  
11 statement. It's not even --  
12 JUDGE SIEGEL: I think the  
13 statement was that for the volumes that fell  
14 within where you would do frame due date time  
15 that frame date due time that that CLEC was  
16 predominantly doing.  
17 MR. COOPER: Yes, that particular  
18 CLEC was predominantly doing, but it is less  
19 than 50 percent of the total if I --  
20 MS. LaVALLE: For that CLEC?  
21 JUDGE SIEGEL: No, for the  
22 universe.  
23 MR. COOPER: For the universe.  
24 JUDGE SIEGEL: But the majority  
25 of that CLEC at least within that volume. And I

Page 48

1 think you also stated that there was another  
2 CLEC that was doing frame due time with  
3 Southwestern Bell, just not in Texas.  
4 MR. COOPER: That's correct.  
5 MS. LaVALLE: Are the volumes of  
6 the other CLECs in Texas comparable to AT&T's?  
7 I'm just trying to get an idea of the maturity  
8 of the frame due date time. I don't want to  
9 know who it is --  
10 JUDGE SIEGEL: I'd rather have  
11 them not answer that because I might be -- you  
12 might be able to tell, and I just don't know if  
13 that other CLEC would want that on the record.  
14 MS. LaVALLE: Okay. I just want  
15 to know if they're going to report that they've  
16 processed a certain number of frame due date  
17 time orders against our report that we had an  
18 inability to have a successful trial yet at what  
19 level and what volume Southwestern Bell believes  
20 it has processed frame due date time. If that's  
21 information you can provide to us, we'll have a  
22 better understanding of this evolution and  
23 maturity, we'd make that request.  
24 MR. HUGHES: Kathleen?  
25 MS. LaVALLE: Yes.

Page 49

1 MR. HUGHES: Are you -- were you  
2 going to go on to something else?  
3 MS. LaVALLE: Yes.  
4 MR. HUGHES: On frame due time,  
5 we would agree the trial didn't go the way  
6 either party wanted it to. We would further  
7 state that the parties have agreed to work  
8 through the process to try to come up with some  
9 parameters, possibly do another trial.  
10 Recognizing, as Sarah mentioned, we don't want  
11 to jeopardize live customers, we need to  
12 minimize the impact to those end users.  
13 I think it's Southwestern Bell's  
14 preference, as we said, to do frame due time.  
15 Charles has instituted some things in the center  
16 that we think will alleviate the problems and  
17 we're hopeful that AT&T will give us another  
18 chance.  
19 JUDGE SIEGEL: One part of the  
20 process that I thought was helpful that, it's my  
21 understanding didn't work on the trial that  
22 hopefully would work in the future, is having  
23 someone in the LOC do an MLT test at the  
24 30-minute mark, half way, to double -- to see if  
25 the activity has taken place.

Page 50

1 MR. COOPER: Right.  
2 JUDGE SIEGEL: And that if that  
3 activity hasn't taken place, they would then  
4 call over to the central office and say, you  
5 know, "We've only got 30 minutes left."  
6 MR. COOPER: Yeah. Proactively  
7 to make sure it happens within 45 minutes.  
8 JUDGE SIEGEL: Okay, 15 minutes  
9 left then.  
10 MS. LaVALLE: And in connection  
11 with the -- I think the statement was made by  
12 Southwestern Bell -- one of the issues is really  
13 a change in the call through of the central  
14 office technician and that's an issue that  
15 hopefully will be addressed in the process  
16 review and improvement as well. And then the --  
17 MS. MURRAY: Kathleen, can I  
18 interrupt you?  
19 MS. LaVALLE: Sure.  
20 MS. MURRAY: I think we've been  
21 talking on and off the record -- and hopefully  
22 we're not going to go through kind of everything  
23 that was said. I mean, in terms of going  
24 forward with commitments, I think that we've  
25 made a commitment to work with AT&T to get the

Page

1 FDT -- to look at doing another FDT trial and  
2 moving on from there.  
3 MS. LaVALLE: I would like to  
4 come back and be allowed to say, "How about that  
5 issue about the calls with the CO technician?  
6 Let's get together and report on how that's been  
7 addressed and improved." So that's what we're  
8 trying to capture for purposes of moving  
9 forward.  
10 MS. MURRAY: I think that for  
11 purposes of moving forward the way to look at  
12 that is the results on FDT and how that works  
13 moving forward. I don't think we're making a  
14 commitment to -- we told you that in order to  
15 make this work we're looking at a number of  
16 different processes. And just -- the place to  
17 look at that, I think, will be in how FDT works  
18 moving forward.  
19 MS. LaVALLE: Another issue  
20 raised was the impact of choosing frame due date  
21 time versus hot cut -- coordinated hot cuts in  
22 terms of volume handling. AT&T reported that it  
23 had been advised that difficulty in meeting time  
24 of day due time, those issues were arising in  
25 the coordinated time cut arena and that those

Page :

1 might be addressed by moving to frame due date  
2 time.  
3 So that's one of the issues that was  
4 discussed, as well as I think AT&T asked a  
5 question would the possibility not be out there  
6 that if we've doubled our volume that that  
7 probably meeting a particular time of day would  
8 move to a problem in meeting a particular date,  
9 and that Southwestern Bell acknowledged that  
10 possibility, that it could move in that  
11 direction and that's why the parties were going  
12 to look at frame due time. Is that fair?  
13 MR. HUGHES: That's fair.  
14 Southwestern Bell has worked with AT&T or will  
15 work with AT&T I think is a better way to put it  
16 on the issue of the due date and due time. We  
17 believe if you go to frame due time it  
18 alleviates that concern that you have.  
19 To your point about the ability to  
20 handle or not handle, I think we also discussed  
21 today that the LOC and LSC have already  
22 resources and will be looking to add more  
23 resources in the future to handle volumes.  
24 Certainly the forecast that AT&T provides us are  
25 most helpful in making sure that we do staff

Page 53

1 appropriately to handle your needs.  
2 MS. LaVALLE: Just a couple more  
3 points. Southwestern Bell has committed that  
4 it, as of two weeks ago on a going-forward  
5 basis, they're doing a real time review to have  
6 more specific information where there is a  
7 provisioning problem. Southwestern Bell also  
8 committed to look at other examples of when  
9 Southwestern Bell has canceled an order. Those  
10 are the issues where we provided some examples  
11 to them.  
12 MS. DeYOUNG: I have a couple.  
13 Southwestern Bell agreed that they would be  
14 revisiting the standard interval for UNE Loop  
15 with LNP orders to make it the same as UNE Loop  
16 orders and allow for the CLEC to be able to rely  
17 on a standard interval that was based on  
18 transmission of an error-free LSR as opposed to  
19 some combination of the FOC interval and the SOC  
20 interval.  
21 We also raised data integrity issues  
22 with the performance measures and the need for  
23 raw data. We had a commitment from Southwestern  
24 Bell that we would receive raw data on those  
25 measures we requested it on by early October.

Page 54

1 Is that correct?  
2 MR. HUGHES: That's correct.  
3 JUDGE SIEGEL: As far as --  
4 MS. LaVALLE: -- made a request to  
5 accelerate that, but understand that  
6 Southwestern Bell is not in a position today to  
7 give us an earlier date than early October.  
8 I also had one other action item which  
9 was looking into missing service order  
10 completions.  
11 MS. DeYOUNG: Right.  
12 MS. LaVALLE: That AT&T had  
13 provided data to Southwestern Bell and  
14 Southwestern Bell has agreed that they will  
15 review that data so that we can have an  
16 understanding of why certain SOCs have been  
17 either missing or delayed.  
18 JUDGE SIEGEL: And that's data  
19 that you gave them today?  
20 MS. DeYOUNG: Yesterday. Is that  
21 right?  
22 MS. CONWAY: We have an action  
23 item to ensure that we did get that to you. I  
24 had a commitment internally that we were going  
25 to get that to you, and I didn't get a chance --

Page 55

1 JUDGE SIEGEL: And we talked  
2 about UNE-L --  
3 MS. CONWAY: That's correct.  
4 MR. HUGHES: Howard, if I could  
5 have one more -- we committed that on MLT when  
6 you called us we would give you greater than the  
7 English version. We would give you the  
8 (inaudible) codes that you would see had been  
9 able to access --  
10 MS. DeYOUNG: Okay.  
11 JUDGE SIEGEL: As far as moving  
12 forward, I think what we had set up is that  
13 Kelly and Michelle are going to get together.  
14 The parties are going to see whether they can  
15 set up a large group face-to-face next week  
16 where Commission Staff can call in if that  
17 appears to -- if the parties believe that will  
18 facilitate that discussion.  
19 Then what I would expect is maybe a  
20 status back following that meeting. And if  
21 we're on, we can do that orally just in terms of  
22 seeing where we need to go, what issues -- what  
23 issues have root causes that appear to already  
24 be ones that have been addressed, what issues  
25 have root causes that are still unclear on what

Page 56

1 ones have root causes that are clearly still out  
2 there and need to be addressed; and/or are root  
3 causes that are just, you know, something that  
4 the retail and wholesale side just have to work  
5 with.  
6 MS. DALTON: I guess I understood  
7 that face-to-face meeting to be centered around  
8 performance measures, and I think we have the  
9 task force that we're kicking off tomorrow to  
10 get at root cause of outages. We have an  
11 account team meeting scheduled for the 29th to  
12 talk about next steps associated with commercial  
13 issues. Root causes should feed into that  
14 particular meeting and that activity, Howard,  
15 where I would envision that we will go through  
16 root causes of commercial issues and see what  
17 next steps are as well as to take a crack at  
18 understanding and documenting the process.  
19 So I think that there are actually  
20 three items that -- three sets of meetings that  
21 are in the very near future. One is scheduled  
22 between Kelly and Michelle. Tom and we already  
23 have a meeting scheduled for talking about next  
24 steps on commercial efforts on the 29th. I hope  
25 that will have some root cause coming out of the

Page 57

1 repair maintenance work that's already underway  
2 to act upon for that particular meeting.  
3 JUDGE SIEGEL: -- and we'll get a  
4 group status report --  
5 MS. DALTON: And then we'd need a  
6 group status report following that.  
7 MR. HUGHES: Nancy, did you  
8 mention the third? Was that the task force --  
9 you said there were three meetings.  
10 MS. DALTON: Task force is  
11 tomorrow, ours is the 29th and then there's one  
12 to be scheduled, I believe, on performance  
13 measures for the dial-in while you're in  
14 Princeton.  
15 JUDGE SIEGEL: And it is the 29th  
16 meeting when y'all will be talking about the D,  
17 N & C and try to --  
18 MR. HUGHES: That was a meeting  
19 that we had actually set up with the account  
20 team, and Nancy and her team were going to be  
21 bringing in -- the plan is to bring in some  
22 operations folks, kind of continue, I guess,  
23 talking about some of these issues that we  
24 discussed today and just more on-going  
25 discussion in the daily interactions that we

Page 58

1 have between the teams working through these  
2 issues.  
3 MS. DALTON: The end in mind  
4 being that we won't have to get together to talk  
5 about those issues. We'll get a process in  
6 place where our centers will have the tools and  
7 the opportunities by which to address the  
8 issues.  
9 JUDGE SIEGEL: Anything else?  
10 MR. HUDSON: I don't want to  
11 belabor any points that have been brought up,  
12 but I have in my notes a number of items where  
13 instead of the going-forward items, they are  
14 items that it looks like Southwestern Bell has  
15 implemented certain things over the past few  
16 weeks. I've got six -- five or six items here  
17 that are directly applicable to the items on the  
18 list. I don't know if they want to go over any  
19 of those things they've done or not.  
20 MS. DALTON: I had those in my  
21 summarized notes.  
22 MR. HUGHES: I think we'll  
23 quickly go through them. If you had others,  
24 we're certainly open to them.  
25 I think one that we just talked about

Page

1 was the MLT code issue, getting back more than  
2 an English version of it, but actually getting  
3 some specific coding.  
4 We also talked a little bit today  
5 about actually a process where AT&T could  
6 contact the LOC. And if it was a provisioning  
7 issue, rather than referring them to the LSC,  
8 the LOC will handle the call.  
9 There was some discussion by AT&T that  
10 that issue came up again yesterday, and we will  
11 go back and make sure we reeducate everybody on  
12 the proper process --  
13 JUDGE SIEGEL: Tom, if you're  
14 going -- I think -- and maybe I'm reading  
15 something. I think what Paul is thinking --  
16 MR. HUGHES: -- more specific to  
17 this.  
18 JUDGE SIEGEL: Yes.  
19 MR. HUGHES: Okay. I apologize.  
20 I think the first one that we had one  
21 on -- well, I won't go any further. I'll start  
22 with No. 12, the billing issues. We put  
23 something in mid-July as we mentioned in CRIS to  
24 keep final bills zero due being sent to AT&T end  
25 users.

Page 6

1 No. 13 was associated with 10 records,  
2 which are records passed back and forth between  
3 the companies as we mentioned.  
4 JUDGE SIEGEL: And for the  
5 record, these numbers are referring to the table  
6 captioned "Commercial Activity Issues" that is  
7 attached to -- I'm sorry to AT&T's September  
8 2nd, 1999 filing in Project No. 16251, captioned  
9 "AT&T's Report on Recent Commercial Activity  
10 Issues Impacting Customer Service."  
11 MR. HUGHES: Thank you. On  
12 No. 14 we instituted something in early July  
13 that would allow AT&T to receive a FOC back  
14 rather than a reject.  
15 On No. 16 the parties have jointly  
16 agreed on the indefinite address issue on an  
17 interim process to handle service orders until  
18 the 10-23 release.  
19 And then back on -- I'm sorry for  
20 jumping around -- No. 8 and 9, we committed that  
21 we'd have retraining done with all our  
22 technicians by the middle of August and that was  
23 in fact completed.  
24 And then back on No. 5, which was the  
25 issue associated with the AIN situation, on some

1                   C E R T I F I C A T E  
2  
3       STATE OF TEXAS       )  
      COUNTY OF TRAVIS    )  
4  
5                   I, Lou Ray, Certified Shorthand  
6 Reporter in and for the State of Texas, do  
7 hereby certify that the above-mentioned matter  
8 occurred as hereinbefore set out.  
9                   I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT the proceedings  
10 of such were reported by me or under my  
11 supervision, later reduced to typewritten form  
12 under my supervision and control and that the  
13 foregoing pages are a full, true, and correct  
14 transcription of the original notes.  
15                   IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto  
16 set my hand and seal this 22nd day of September  
17 1999.  
18  
19  
20  
21                   \_\_\_\_\_  
22                   Lou Ray  
23                   Certified Shorthand Reporter  
                  CSR No. 1791 - Expires 12/31/99  
                  Kennedy Reporting Service, Inc.  
                  800 Brazos, Suite 340  
                  Austin, Texas 78701.  
24  
25

Page 61

1 of AT&T's orders on UNE-P conversions in July,  
2 we had our software (inaudible) in mid-August  
3 that corrected that problem.  
4 MS. DALTON: Can I supplement  
5 that? I think we have an action item, however,  
6 to validate that we don't have a reoccurring  
7 issue with No. 5. And also No. 10, the issue is  
8 that associated with generating out clock  
9 issues, those records are no longer being  
10 generated to us when we move a customer from  
11 resale to UNE or at all at this point in time.  
12 And that was implemented I'm not sure when, Tom.  
13 MR. HUGHES: I'm not sure. I  
14 need to check.  
15 MS. DALTON: But that has been  
16 implemented.  
17 JUDGE SIEGEL: And the way that  
18 has been set up, if I remember correctly, is  
19 Southwestern Bell stated that they cannot  
20 distinguish between whether it's a resell UNE-P  
21 or retail UNE-P, and so AT&T needs to either  
22 just take all of them, whether it's resale or  
23 retail, or none of them.  
24 MR. HUGHES: We can't  
25 differentiate resale to UNE-P or, if an AT&T end

Page 62

1 user is converted to someone else, not retail to  
2 UNE-P.  
3 JUDGE SIEGEL: Okay. Thank you.  
4 MR. HUGHES: And the other one --  
5 that was actually Issue 11. The other is Issue  
6 10 where we had a queuing issue in early July.  
7 We believe we have that fixed, and given that  
8 AT&T has sent volumes of orders since then, we  
9 think that's being identified, but AT&T still  
10 has a question about the performance measure.  
11 MS. DALTON: Correct. And the  
12 ones that have been assigned -- passed over the  
13 interim fix was implemented by AT&T on September  
14 10th to populate the fields in the way in which  
15 Southwestern Bell is requesting and Southwestern  
16 Bell has implemented an additional interim fix  
17 associated with those particular orders.  
18 I think there were two items that were  
19 done on that, one on our side and one on yours.  
20 MR. BANNECKER: Bob Bannecker  
21 with Southwestern Bell.  
22 We had one interim measure that we had  
23 put in place. That is prior to the final  
24 deployment going in on the 23rd -- there's only  
25 one interim measure from our perspective.

Page 63

1 MR. KETTELL: I think the point  
2 is -- this is David Kettell -- that not only did  
3 Southwestern Bell implement the interim change,  
4 but AT&T had to make changes to adhere to that  
5 interim change.  
6 MS. DALTON: And that is interim  
7 until our final coding is done concurrent with  
8 the October 25th release as well.  
9 JUDGE SIEGEL: Which testing  
10 started yesterday.  
11 MS. DALTON: Correct.  
12 MS. LAVALLE: And just to  
13 clarify, even though the release comes out on  
14 October 23rd and addresses those business rule  
15 issues, our understanding from Southwestern Bell  
16 is that there will still be a flow-through issue  
17 in connection with those indefinite address  
18 orders; that there will still be manual fallout  
19 even after the October 23rd release.  
20 MR. HUGHES: And that manual  
21 fallout will be on orders that are at the  
22 community name, which we wholeheartedly believe  
23 is an extremely small subset of customers.  
24 JUDGE SIEGEL: That was one of  
25 the issues you were going to look and see how

Page 64

1 that was on the retail side?  
2 MR. HUGHES: That's correct.  
3 JUDGE SIEGEL: I think we are  
4 nearing the end. One thing, 21000 is a fairly  
5 new docket. I'm not sure how different or how  
6 alike it is with some other dockets. But off  
7 line, if anyone has any feedback or suggestions,  
8 we can take comments confidentially if you'd  
9 like, anonymously if you'd like, just to make  
10 sure that the process works well.  
11 As you know, the goal is to try to  
12 address the issues at a little bit closer to the  
13 folks that are working them and trying to do  
14 things a little more informally and clarify  
15 getting information out. So I think it's been  
16 productive and we'll keep working on them.  
17 If there's nothing else, let's go off  
18 the record and adjourn.  
19 (The proceedings in Docket No.  
20 21000 were adjourned at 6:35 p.m.)  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>-&amp;-</b></p> <p>&amp; [3] 16:13 24:9 57:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-0-</b></p> <p>0+ [1] 31:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-1-</b></p> <p>1 [2] 7:4 29:1 1.6 [1] 42:20 10 [3] 60:1 61:7 62:6 10-23 [1] 60:18 10th [1] 62:14 11 [1] 62:5 114 [1] 41:23 115 [4] 40:1 41:21,23 42:1 11:00 [2] 4:13 5:25 12 [1] 59:22 12/31/99 [1] 65:21 13 [1] 60:1 14 [2] 34:9 60:12 15 [2] 19:11 50:8 15th [2] 18:22,24 16 [1] 60:15 16251 [3] 30:14 43:16 60:8 17 [1] 45:24 1701 [1] 1:13 1791 [1] 65:21 1999 [5] 1:9,11 2:2 60:8 65:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-2-</b></p> <p>21 [2] 1:9 2:2 21000 [4] 1:7 2:6 64:4 64:20 21st [1] 1:11 22nd [1] 65:16 23rd [4] 40:9 62:24 63:14 63:19 25th [1] 63:8 271 [1] 43:10 283 [1] 43:10 29th [7] 18:5,6 26:13 56:11,24 57:11,15 2nd [1] 60:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-3-</b></p> <p>3 [1] 7:5 30 [1] 50:5 30-minute [1] 49:24 340 [1] 65:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-4-</b></p> <p>45 [1] 50:7 4:30 [1] 1:10</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>-5-</b></p> <p>5 [2] 60:24 61:7 50 [3] 46:17 47:1,19 5:25 [1] 2:3 5E [1] 31:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-6-</b></p> <p>6:35 [1] 64:20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-7-</b></p> <p>78701 [2] 1:14 65:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-8-</b></p> <p>8 [1] 60:20 800 [1] 65:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-9-</b></p> <p>9 [2] 45:23 60:20 9-0-1 [1] 23:15 9-1-1 [1] 23:15</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-A-</b></p> <p>a.m [1] 4:13 ability [1] 52:19 able [13] 6:25 12:15 18:3 19:19 31:14 34:1 40:21 40:25 42:3 46:7 48:12 53:16 55:9 above-entitled [1] 1:11 above-mentioned [1] 65:7 absolutely [1] 13:17 accelerate [1] 54:5 acceptance [1] 45:9 accepting [1] 14:15 access [1] 55:9 accessible [1] 27:6 account [5] 5:1 9:17 15:12 56:11 57:19 accountability [1] 38:14 accounting [1] 7:11 accounts [1] 27:13 accuracy [1] 23:16 acknowledged [1] 52:9 act [1] 57:2 action [21] 4:7 6:9 8:1 15:18 20:12,18 21:20 23:20 24:11 25:1 27:5,9 29:10 32:7 33:7,22 34:6 35:3 54:8,22 61:5 actions [2] 27:1 37:25 activities [2] 11:3 23:19 activity [11] 10:24 42:16 43:23,24 44:8 46:17 49:25 50:3 56:14 60:6,9 add [2] 9:3 52:22 added [2] 9:23 16:6</p>	<p>adding [1] 5:20 addition [2] 15:2 20:11 additional [11] 18:11,21 18:23 26:19 28:22 29:5 33:6,17 35:10 41:17 62:16 address [18] 10:19,24,25 11:12,14,21 12:4,7,10 13:19 16:15 17:2 26:24 34:3 58:7 60:16 63:17 64:12 addressed [9] 30:14,16 37:22 43:7 50:15 51:7 52:1 55:24 56:2 addressees [1] 17:11 addresses [11] 7:22,24 16:14,18 23:23 31:12,13 31:19,22,24 63:14 addressing [1] 27:23 adhere [1] 63:4 adjourn [1] 64:18 adjourned [1] 64:20 ADMINISTRATIVE [1] 1:15 advantage [1] 25:20 advised [1] 51:23 affecting [1] 43:10 afraid [1] 29:15 afternoon [1] 42:22 again [4] 18:12 26:25 33:25 59:10 against [2] 37:10 48:17 agents [1] 27:20 ago [1] 53:4 agree [13] 12:4 13:18 15:9 17:8,18 18:9 22:18 34:2 34:20,24 36:24 44:24 49:5 agreeable [2] 18:7 25:17 agreed [22] 6:17,24 7:13 10:11 11:25 12:24 13:4 16:19 21:17 22:17 23:25 28:20 29:11 32:16 34:16 35:19 37:7 45:9 49:7 53:13 54:14 60:16 agreement [5] 14:20 35:9 38:8,12 45:16 agrees [1] 38:1 ahead [2] 4:7 28:21 AIN [9] 18:13,18 19:13 19:16,20,23 20:3,8 60:25 Al [1] 6:16 alike [1] 64:6 alleviate [1] 49:16 alleviates [1] 52:18 allow [2] 53:16 60:13 allowed [1] 51:4 alluded [1] 18:15 Along [1] 20:6 alternative [1] 34:17 always [1] 26:2 amount [1] 42:12 analysis [9] 10:6 12:14 12:25 16:20 17:15 18:3</p>	<p>24:1 28:24 29:6 ank [1] 59:11 anonymously [1] 64:9 answer [4] 26:11,16 42:10 48:11 answered [1] 28:18 apologize [1] 59:19 appear [3] 15:9 38:20 55:23 appeared [1] 46:1 appearing [1] 38:24 applicable [2] 37:10 58:17 apply [2] 29:21 30:22 apprised [1] 37:19 appropriately [1] 53:1 arena [1] 51:25 arising [1] 51:24 assent [1] 4:16 assigned [1] 62:12 associated [11] 4:21 5:15,22 11:4 12:7 22:11 56:12 60:1,25 61:8 62:17 assume [1] 33:23 assuming [1] 37:16 AT&amp;T [70] 2:16,17,19 2:20,22,24 3:1,3,4,5,22 3:24,24 4:3,13 5:6,12,23 6:4,13,18 8:1 9:4,7 10:7 15:7,18 16:15,20 18:12 22:5 26:18 27:13 33:12 34:10,16 35:10,16 36:1,5 36:14,17,22 38:1,17,20 39:12 41:6 42:9 44:6,21 45:14 49:17 50:25 51:22 52:4,14,15,24 54:12 59:5 59:9,24 60:13 61:21,25 62:8,9,13 63:4 AT&amp;T's [13] 2:8 4:16 4:22 34:1 41:3 42:17 43:2 43:14 45:10 48:6 60:7,9 61:1 attached [1] 60:7 August [9] 5:4,12 7:4,6 13:3 18:22,23 19:11 60:22 Austin [3] 1:4,14 65:23 automatically [1] 23:10 availability [1] 27:7 available [4] 15:21 16:8 39:10 45:11 Avenue [1] 1:13 average [1] 37:2 aware [1] 37:23 away [1] 14:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-B-</b></p> <p>balance [1] 22:5 Bannecker [3] 3:6,6 10:15,16 37:11,12 62:20 62:20 base [2] 17:22 22:21 based [5] 34:1 37:16 40:6</p>	<p>41:24 53:17 basis [3] 5:18 22:15 53:5 become [2] 17:7 22:9 becomes [2] 13:25 14:21 begin [2] 5:4,25 behind [4] 7:17 8:11 12:13 26:20 belabor [1] 58:11 believes [1] 48:19 Bell [97] 3:7,9,11,13,15 3:17,19,21 4:3,12,19 5:23 7:2,8 8:2,16 10:7,9,16 11:24 12:17,17,23 13:9 15:3,11,17 16:5,11 17:17 18:14,20 19:6,11 20:7,12 20:17 21:22 22:2,23 23:2 24:14,17 25:3,10,18 26:5 26:21,23 27:1,4,13,22 28:6,20 31:15 32:15 34:1 35:9,19,23 36:16 37:8,12 38:9,22 39:7 41:22 42:1 42:22 43:13 44:17,24 45:1 45:15 46:7,11 48:3,19 50:12 52:9,14 53:3,7,9,13 53:24 54:6,13,14 58:14 61:19 62:15,16,21 63:3 63:15 Bell's [4] 16:17 36:20,21 49:13 BellSouth [1] 43:11 belongs [1] 14:25 best [1] 17:4 better [7] 12:15 24:20 28:11 32:19 33:5 48:22 52:15 between [12] 4:12 7:24 8:5 10:7 31:2 35:16 38:13 43:4 56:22 58:1 60:2 61:20 big [1] 13:25 bigger [1] 9:11 bill [2] 22:3,4 billing [1] 59:22 bills [1] 59:24 bit [3] 9:11 59:4 64:12 block [2] 31:2,6 board [1] 26:7 Bob [7] 3:6 8:19 10:15 12:5 37:11 38:5 62:20 bogged [1] 14:1 Bourianoff [2] 2:25 3:1 Brazos [1] 65:22 brief [1] 43:12 bring [3] 10:11 42:23 57:21 bringing [1] 57:21 broader [1] 40:14 brought [2] 37:18 58:11 bucket [1] 13:25 Buckwalter [2] 3:10,11 business [4] 32:20 33:3 43:8 63:14</p>
--	--	---	---	---

-C-				
<p><b>C</b> [11] 2:1 7:21 11:21 16:13 23:25 24:9 25:7 35:21 57:17 65:1,1 <b>calls</b> [6] 22:12 31:5,6 37:19,23 51:5 <b>cancel</b> [1] 35:20 <b>canceled</b> [4] 36:6,10,12 53:9 <b>cancellation</b> [1] 35:8 <b>Candy</b> [5] 3:20 34:8 36:4 37:20 42:5 <b>cannot</b> [3] 36:17 44:21 61:19 <b>capabilities</b> [1] 6:22 <b>captioned</b> [2] 60:6,8 <b>capture</b> [1] 51:8 <b>captured</b> [1] 44:14 <b>capturing</b> [3] 41:7 42:2 42:11 <b>carrier</b> [1] 30:9 <b>categories</b> [2] 7:18 44:19 <b>caused</b> [2] 16:17 25:15 <b>causes</b> [11] 7:19 8:11 28:12 32:17,18 55:23,25 56:1,3,13,16 <b>causing</b> [1] 12:10 <b>center</b> [6] 4:23,24 9:10 41:10,11 49:15 <b>centered</b> [1] 56:7 <b>centers</b> [2] 4:25 58:6 <b>central</b> [5] 8:15 29:18 46:8 50:4,13 <b>certain</b> [3] 48:16 54:16 58:15 <b>certainly</b> [2] 52:24 58:24 <b>Certified</b> [3] 1:16 65:5 65:21 <b>certify</b> [2] 65:7,9 <b>cetera</b> [1] 43:18 <b>chance</b> [2] 49:18 54:25 <b>change</b> [7] 16:7 23:8,9 34:9 50:13 63:3,5 <b>changes</b> [2] 21:24 63:4 <b>changing</b> [1] 44:1 <b>Charles</b> [12] 3:18 6:5 12:22 19:16,22,25 21:6 27:10,15 29:3 46:16 49:15 <b>check</b> [4] 23:6 27:11 32:1 61:14 <b>checks</b> [1] 23:16 <b>choosing</b> [1] 51:20 <b>cited</b> [4] 19:12,17,18 23:22 <b>city</b> [1] 46:5 <b>clarification</b> [1] 44:11 <b>clarify</b> [5] 36:19 37:13 42:4 63:13 64:14 <b>class</b> [2] 20:8 21:8 <b>clear</b> [2] 36:9 38:4</p>	<p><b>clearly</b> [2] 11:25 56:1 <b>CLEC</b> [10] 28:16 46:12 47:4,15,18,20,25 48:2,13 53:16 <b>CLECs</b> [3] 34:10 40:15 48:6 <b>clock</b> [1] 61:8 <b>close</b> [1] 42:15 <b>closer</b> [1] 64:12 <b>closes</b> [1] 15:6 <b>CO</b> [1] 51:5 <b>code</b> [3] 20:8 34:14 59:1 <b>codes</b> [3] 21:8 27:21 55:8 <b>coding</b> [2] 59:3 63:7 <b>collect</b> [1] 22:12 <b>collected</b> [1] 44:8 <b>collection</b> [1] 43:3 <b>collocate</b> [1] 29:20 <b>combination</b> [1] 53:19 <b>comfortable</b> [1] 24:22 <b>coming</b> [4] 15:8 41:1 43:5 56:25 <b>comment</b> [1] 39:11 <b>comments</b> [5] 43:3,14 43:17 44:17 64:8 <b>commercial</b> [13] 2:8,8 25:12 42:16 43:5,23,24 44:8 56:12,16,24 60:6,9 <b>Commission</b> [6] 1:3,13 30:13 42:19,20 55:16 <b>commit</b> [3] 6:5 12:18 21:13 <b>commitment</b> [9] 13:6 15:3,25 28:5 31:1 50:25 51:14 53:23 54:24 <b>commitments</b> [2] 35:23 50:24 <b>committed</b> [10] 5:23 7:7 13:2 15:17 16:5 20:7 53:3 53:8 55:5 60:20 <b>common</b> [2] 32:17,18 <b>communicate</b> [1] 36:22 <b>community</b> [1] 63:22 <b>companies</b> [2] 8:14 60:3 <b>company</b> [1] 17:11 <b>comparable</b> [2] 31:17 48:6 <b>comparably</b> [1] 32:1 <b>complete</b> [2] 24:6 28:15 <b>completed</b> [1] 60:23 <b>completion</b> [2] 24:5 44:22 <b>completions</b> [2] 42:3 54:10 <b>comports</b> [1] 41:3 <b>comprehensive</b> [4] 6:18 7:12 14:7 26:1 <b>comprised</b> [1] 14:11 <b>computing</b> [1] 33:22 <b>concern</b> [9] 10:8 13:10 15:7 18:20 39:22,24 40:3</p>	<p>43:2 52:18 <b>concerning</b> [1] 40:10 <b>concerns</b> [2] 39:21 41:7 <b>conclude</b> [3] 17:12,13 17:16 <b>conclusions</b> [1] 11:20 <b>concurrent</b> [1] 63:7 <b>confidentially</b> [1] 64:8 <b>confirm</b> [1] 34:18 <b>confirmation</b> [1] 19:10 <b>confirmed</b> [1] 41:22 <b>conflict</b> [1] 31:2 <b>Congress</b> [1] 1:13 <b>connection</b> [2] 50:10 63:17 <b>consensus</b> [1] 14:24 <b>contact</b> [2] 8:16 59:6 <b>continue</b> [2] 33:9 57:22 <b>continues</b> [1] 37:24 <b>continuing</b> [1] 36:14 <b>contrary</b> [2] 38:21 39:13 <b>control</b> [1] 65:12 <b>controversies</b> [2] 7:22 7:23 <b>controversy</b> [2] 11:20 12:4 <b>conversion</b> [1] 19:1 <b>conversions</b> [3] 32:19 33:4 61:1 <b>converted</b> [2] 22:3 62:1 <b>Conway</b> [8] 3:20,20 36:3 36:4 38:7 42:6 54:22 55:3 <b>Cooper</b> [19] 3:18,18 6:7 12:22,23 19:24,25 29:16 30:1,6,17 46:20 47:3,10 47:17,23 48:4 50:1,6 <b>coordinated</b> [3] 5:16 51:21,25 <b>coordinators</b> [1] 8:25 <b>copper</b> [1] 29:8 <b>correct</b> [2] 15:20 19:17 22:14 23:11 27:2,8,17 28:9 31:10 34:11 36:3 37:7 38:7 42:4 46:25 48:4 54:1,2 62:11 63:11 64:2 65:13 <b>correct.0</b> [1] 55:3 <b>corrected</b> [1] 61:3 <b>corrections</b> [1] 23:1 <b>corrective</b> [2] 27:1 37:24 <b>correctly</b> [1] 61:18 <b>COs</b> [1] 46:5 <b>count</b> [1] 37:9 <b>COUNTY</b> [1] 65:3 <b>couple</b> [5] 19:12 21:3 28:4 53:2,12 <b>course</b> [2] 39:9 44:25 <b>covered</b> [3] 21:6 39:23 40:1 <b>covering</b> [1] 6:19 <b>Cowlishaw</b> [5] 3:2,2</p>	<p>41:18,19 42:8 <b>crack</b> [1] 56:17 <b>create</b> [1] 8:7 <b>CRIS</b> [9] 7:25 21:24 22:8 22:16,21,22 23:2,9 59:23 <b>Crissey</b> [2] 2:17,17 <b>CSR</b> [1] 65:21 <b>customer</b> [6] 19:2,18 22:3,22 60:10 61:10 <b>customers</b> [5] 7:11 33:18 34:5 49:11 63:23 <b>customized</b> [1] 31:3 <b>cut</b> [9] 5:16 35:12 36:6,10 36:11 42:13,13 51:21,25 <b>cutover</b> [1] 40:3 <b>cutovers</b> [1] 39:25 <b>cuts</b> [2] 41:24 51:21</p>	<p><b>deployment</b> [1] 62:24 <b>describe</b> [1] 8:3 <b>described</b> [2] 7:18 17:15 <b>description</b> [1] 20:24 <b>designed</b> [1] 9:23 <b>detail</b> [3] 7:9 12:14 25:17 <b>detailed</b> [3] 15:6 33:14 45:14 <b>determine</b> [9] 5:8 11:17 12:9 16:21,23,24 18:5 19:1,6 <b>determined</b> [1] 11:11 <b>determining</b> [2] 5:17 6:1 <b>deWater</b> [1] 8:18 <b>DeYoung</b> [17] 3:23,23 9:6,6 33:11,12,25 34:24 35:7 36:13 37:4 38:1,8 53:12 54:11,20 55:10 <b>dial</b> [1] 6:19 <b>dial-in</b> [1] 57:13 <b>dialed</b> [1] 31:6 <b>dialing</b> [1] 6:21 <b>different</b> [9] 7:18 12:7 16:13,18 27:12 30:21 43:16 51:16 64:5 <b>differentiate</b> [2] 10:12 61:25 <b>difficulties</b> [1] 39:24 <b>difficulty</b> [1] 51:23 <b>digital</b> [2] 30:8,10 <b>directed</b> [1] 22:1 <b>direction</b> [1] 52:11 <b>directly</b> [2] 29:18 58:17 <b>directory</b> [1] 23:14 <b>disaggregated</b> [1] 44:16 <b>disagree</b> [2] 14:6 34:25 <b>disagreement</b> [1] 6:25 <b>disconnects</b> [1] 41:24 <b>discrepancy</b> [1] 8:5 <b>discuss</b> [3] 18:6 41:1 42:17 <b>discussed</b> [9] 5:20 16:9 16:12 34:22 36:14 44:10 52:4,20 57:24 <b>discussing</b> [1] 43:20 <b>discussion</b> [16] 5:11 7:16 9:22 12:21 21:5,7 24:12 25:12 33:8 35:8 41:12 43:23 45:14 55:18 57:25 59:9 <b>discussions</b> [1] 42:25 <b>dispatch</b> [2] 38:10,10 <b>dispute</b> [3] 1:5 2:6,7 <b>distinguish</b> [1] 61:20 <b>docket</b> [5] 1:6 2:6 43:16 64:5,19 <b>dockets</b> [1] 64:6 <b>document</b> [2] 32:25 43:4 <b>documenting</b> [2] 26:3 56:18 <b>doesn't</b> [2] 14:25 21:15</p>
			<p align="center">-D-</p>	

<p>done [9] 10:6 17:15 24:4 24:21 36:2 58:19 60:21 62:19 63:7</p> <p>double [1] 49:24</p> <p>doubled [1] 52:6</p> <p>down [9] 13:16 14:1,20 21:21 24:11,17 25:9 32:13 33:13</p> <p>draft [2] 26:14 32:23</p> <p>due [33] 5:16 22:4 33:9 34:14,15,18 36:17 39:22 40:17 44:12,18 45:15 46:4 46:10,12,14,23 47:14,15 48:2,8,16,20 49:4,14 51:20,24 52:1,12,16,16 52:17 59:24</p> <p>during [4] 39:8,24 41:22 46:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-E-</b></p> <p>E [4] 2:1,1 65:1,1</p> <p>e-mail [1] 45:2</p> <p>early [4] 53:25 54:7 60:12 62:6</p> <p>EASE [2] 31:13,20</p> <p>EDI [2] 27:6 31:24</p> <p>edit [3] 16:6 17:5,18</p> <p>edits [1] 17:10</p> <p>effective [1] 24:16</p> <p>efforts [1] 56:24</p> <p>either [4] 36:15 49:6 54:17 61:21</p> <p>eligibility [1] 15:18</p> <p>Ellis [1] 8:20</p> <p>encountered [1] 26:19</p> <p>end [12] 6:2 13:12 17:6 22:5 31:3,9 42:13 49:12 58:3 59:24 61:25 64:4</p> <p>ended [1] 30:13</p> <p>endure [1] 26:5</p> <p>English [2] 55:7 59:2</p> <p>ensure [3] 22:7,8 54:23</p> <p>entry [1] 2:9</p> <p>environment [2] 28:17 30:3</p> <p>envision [2] 18:2 56:15</p> <p>error-free [1] 53:18</p> <p>escalate [1] 15:11</p> <p>establish [1] 9:18</p> <p>et [1] 43:18</p> <p>everybody [1] 59:11</p> <p>evolution [1] 48:22</p> <p>evolved [1] 9:1</p> <p>example [2] 15:5 24:3</p> <p>examples [19] 7:15 18:24 18:24 19:12,18,22 21:4 21:17 23:22 24:1,3 26:19 28:7 35:10,11,18,19 53:8 53:10</p> <p>except [1] 46:15</p> <p>exclude [1] 45:5</p>	<p>excluding [1] 44:18</p> <p>excuse [2] 18:22 19:25</p> <p>exercise [1] 25:9</p> <p>exist [1] 21:15</p> <p>existing [3] 38:25 39:23 41:15</p> <p>exists [2] 21:15,16</p> <p>expand [1] 13:3</p> <p>expanded [2] 9:1 12:19</p> <p>expect [1] 55:19</p> <p>experience [3] 19:2 43:5 45:24</p> <p>experienced [1] 46:9</p> <p>experts [1] 8:3</p> <p>Expires [1] 65:21</p> <p>explanation [3] 12:15 15:7 33:2</p> <p>expressed [1] 15:7</p> <p>extent [2] 11:9 17:17</p> <p>extremely [1] 63:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-F-</b></p> <p>F [1] 65:1</p> <p>face-to-face [2] 55:15 56:7</p> <p>facilitate [1] 55:18</p> <p>facilities [2] 29:2 30:4</p> <p>fact [12] 8:10 10:23 12:9 12:10 14:11 17:9 24:23 29:4,9 37:15 42:18 60:23</p> <p>factor [1] 12:3</p> <p>factors [1] 19:8</p> <p>fair [3] 15:13 52:12,13</p> <p>fairly [1] 64:4</p> <p>fall [2] 17:6 21:4</p> <p>fallout [3] 20:25 63:18 63:21</p> <p>falls [1] 11:10</p> <p>far [3] 12:25 54:3 55:11</p> <p>FDT [6] 33:14,23 51:1,1 51:12,17</p> <p>fear [1] 29:6</p> <p>features [1] 6:20</p> <p>feed [2] 23:10 56:13</p> <p>feedback [1] 64:7</p> <p>fell [1] 47:13</p> <p>few [1] 58:15</p> <p>field [1] 29:17</p> <p>fields [1] 62:14</p> <p>figure [3] 8:5 11:13 12:5</p> <p>figuring [1] 10:10</p> <p>filed [1] 43:17</p> <p>filing [2] 42:16 60:8</p> <p>fill [1] 4:4</p> <p>final [5] 22:3,4 59:24 62:23 63:7</p> <p>finish [1] 40:3</p> <p>finished [1] 28:1</p> <p>first [6] 11:18 12:9 37:21</p>	<p>38:4,5 59:20</p> <p>fit [1] 45:6</p> <p>five [1] 58:16</p> <p>fix [7] 22:6,9,13,16 40:10 62:13,16</p> <p>fixed [1] 62:7</p> <p>flesh [1] 25:16</p> <p>flicks [1] 30:19</p> <p>flow [6] 24:9 25:13,14,15 33:14,22</p> <p>flow-through [1] 63:16</p> <p>FOC [5] 34:17 40:6,21 53:19 60:13</p> <p>focus [3] 5:10 10:21 11:2</p> <p>focused [1] 41:5</p> <p>focuses [1] 2:7</p> <p>folks [5] 4:25 22:17 31:14 57:22 64:13</p> <p>follow [1] 20:2</p> <p>following [6] 1:15 4:2 31:9 40:6 55:20 57:6</p> <p>force [28] 4:11,15,20,24 5:13,21 6:1,23 7:14 8:13 9:16,18,23 10:7 12:18 13:1,5,12,15,23 14:7,11 14:19 15:2 35:14 56:9 57:8,10</p> <p>forecast [1] 52:24</p> <p>foregoing [1] 65:13</p> <p>form [1] 65:11</p> <p>forth [2] 22:13 60:2</p> <p>forum [2] 14:9 43:20</p> <p>forward [9] 9:20 10:11 23:10 50:24 51:9,11,13 51:18 55:12</p> <p>forwarded [1] 41:10</p> <p>Foster [1] 8:23</p> <p>four-day [3] 44:21 45:4 45:5</p> <p>frame [22] 5:16 33:9 39:22 44:18 45:15 46:4 46:10,12,14,23 47:14,15 48:2,8,16,20 49:4,14 51:20 52:1,12,17</p> <p>framed [1] 44:12</p> <p>free [1] 4:4</p> <p>front [1] 11:6</p> <p>full [1] 65:13</p> <p>fully [1] 26:1</p> <p>function [1] 5:3</p> <p>funneled [1] 13:14</p> <p>future [5] 24:13 25:12 49:22 52:23 56:21</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-G-</b></p> <p>G [1] 2:1</p> <p>gain [1] 29:8</p> <p>gains [1] 29:3</p> <p>gap [3] 25:23,24 43:9</p> <p>gaps [1] 43:4</p> <p>Garry [1] 3:10</p>	<p>Gary [2] 3:14 15:19</p> <p>general [2] 14:24 40:24</p> <p>generated [2] 7:20 61:10</p> <p>generating [1] 61:8</p> <p>Gerri [1] 31:23</p> <p>given [2] 32:8 62:7</p> <p>go-back [1] 33:8</p> <p>goal [1] 64:11</p> <p>going-forward [3] 5:18 53:4 58:13</p> <p>good [2] 24:10 25:9</p> <p>Gordon [2] 3:12,12</p> <p>gray [2] 14:17,21</p> <p>greater [1] 55:6</p> <p>Greg [1] 3:24</p> <p>group [7] 25:21 29:12 38:19 39:18 55:15 57:4,6</p> <p>guess [11] 4:7 9:14 11:8 13:7,11,23 33:11 34:25 47:5 56:6 57:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-H-</b></p> <p>half [1] 49:24</p> <p>Hall [3] 2:20,20 6:15</p> <p>hand [1] 65:16</p> <p>handle [8] 9:19 31:13 52:20,20,23 53:1 59:8 60:17</p> <p>handled [3] 31:24,25 43:19</p> <p>handling [3] 20:15,20 51:22</p> <p>happening [3] 37:15 38:6 47:1</p> <p>Hassbrock [4] 2:15,15 6:15 7:7</p> <p>hate [1] 9:18</p> <p>head [1] 42:7</p> <p>hear [2] 28:17 38:21</p> <p>heard [4] 15:1 37:21 38:5 38:6</p> <p>bearing [3] 1:12 14:23 39:9</p> <p>Heimbach [2] 2:21,21</p> <p>help [2] 4:4 26:10</p> <p>helpful [2] 49:20 52:25</p> <p>hereby [1] 65:7</p> <p>hereinbefore [1] 65:8</p> <p>hereunto [1] 65:15</p> <p>highlight [1] 18:13</p> <p>historically [1] 41:8</p> <p>hold [1] 13:12</p> <p>honoring [1] 45:10</p> <p>hope [3] 11:1 42:4 56:24</p> <p>hoped [2] 42:17 45:18</p> <p>hopeful [1] 49:17</p> <p>hopefully [7] 10:17 18:3 25:25 40:25 49:22 50:15 50:21</p> <p>hot [3] 5:16 51:21,21</p>	<p>Houston [3] 45:21 46:1 46:6</p> <p>Howard [5] 1:14 2:10 8:18 55:4 56:14</p> <p>Hudson [27] 2:13,13 4:6 6:9,12 15:15,24 16:4 17:20 18:11 20:6,11,21 21:20 23:20 26:17 27:3,9 27:18 28:2 32:4,12 33:6 33:21 34:6 35:3 58:10</p> <p>Hughes [50] 3:16,16 4:18 4:18 8:17,24 13:8,8,19 15:14,20 16:1,10,10 17:24 19:5,15 20:10,16,16 21:2 21:13,25 23:6,11 26:9,12 26:15 27:8 31:10 34:11 34:19 36:25 48:24 49:1,4 52:13 54:2 55:4 57:7,18 58:22 59:16,19 60:11 61:13,24 62:4 63:20 64:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-I-</b></p> <p>i.e [1] 10:19</p> <p>idea [4] 15:2 24:10 28:11 48:7</p> <p>identified [2] 7:19 62:9</p> <p>identify [4] 11:25 12:2 14:8 28:14</p> <p>identifying [1] 14:15</p> <p>IDLC [4] 29:14,24,25 30:7</p> <p>impact [3] 43:24 49:12 51:20</p> <p>impacted [2] 17:7 40:22</p> <p>Impacting [1] 60:10</p> <p>implement [1] 63:3</p> <p>implemented [6] 5:19 58:15 61:12,16 62:13,16</p> <p>impression [1] 9:15</p> <p>improperly [1] 41:14</p> <p>improved [1] 51:7</p> <p>improvement [1] 50:16</p> <p>improvements [1] 5:15</p> <p>inability [2] 44:6 48:18</p> <p>inaccuracies [1] 22:22</p> <p>inaudible [4] 29:18 38:19 55:8 61:2</p> <p>Inc [1] 65:22</p> <p>include [3] 12:19 13:1 45:3</p> <p>indefinite [2] 60:16 63:17</p> <p>indicated [2] 26:21 27:14</p> <p>informal [3] 1:5 2:6,7</p> <p>informally [1] 64:14</p> <p>information [9] 8:4 10:13 15:4,8,10 25:4 48:21 53:6 64:15</p> <p>informing [1] 36:1</p> <p>input [1] 10:25</p> <p>installer [1] 26:20</p> <p>instances [4] 18:21,23</p>
---	---	--	--	---

20:19 44:16  
instead [3] 34:17 45:1  
58:13  
instituted [2] 49:15  
60:12  
integrated [5] 29:3,8,17  
30:8,10  
integrity [1] 53:21  
interactions [1] 57:25  
interim [10] 40:8 44:21  
60:17 62:13,16,22,25 63:3  
63:5,6  
internal [1] 32:25  
internally [1] 54:24  
interrupt [1] 50:18  
interval [11] 40:4,6,12  
40:13,22 44:22 45:7 53:14  
53:17,19,20  
intervention [1] 21:1  
invalid [2] 34:14,21  
investigate [2] 32:16  
36:7  
investigations [1] 20:9  
involve [2] 11:2 30:4  
issue [49] 11:14,15 12:10  
12:13 13:20 15:6 16:8,12  
16:16,25 17:4,5,14 18:8  
19:7,13,16,20 22:2,11  
25:15 28:12 29:24 31:25  
34:9,22 35:16 37:14 38:5  
39:15 43:9,23 44:23 46:4  
50:14 51:5,19 52:16 59:1  
59:7,10 60:16,25 61:7,7  
62:5,5,6 63:16  
issued [2] 10:5 11:10  
issues [54] 1:6 2:8 4:21  
5:25 6:8 9:16,16 10:18  
11:2 12:4,6 13:13 14:4,8  
14:10,14,15 15:12 22:2  
25:12 27:7 33:15 38:13  
38:20,23 39:1 41:5,13  
42:14 43:19 44:15 45:12  
45:13 50:12 51:24 52:3  
53:10,21 55:22,23,24  
56:13,16 57:23 58:2,5,8  
59:22 60:6,10 61:9 63:15  
63:25 64:12  
issuing [1] 37:8  
item [25] 6:9 8:1 15:19  
20:12,18 21:20 23:20  
24:11 25:1 26:17 27:3,5,9  
28:19,24,25 29:11 30:25  
32:12 33:7,22 34:7 54:8  
54:23 61:5  
items [14] 4:7,9 18:12  
28:23 32:7 33:24 35:4  
56:20 58:12,13,14,16,17  
62:18

-J-

James [1] 8:20  
jeopardize [1] 49:11  
jeopardy [1] 37:8  
Jerry [1] 3:12

joint [4] 4:11,15,20 10:6  
jointly [1] 60:15  
JUDGE [50] 1:15 2:4 4:1  
8:12 9:3 14:16 21:9,18  
23:3,7,17 24:7 25:19 26:8  
26:10 29:13 30:8 32:24  
34:23 35:1,5,22 36:8 37:1  
38:3 39:16 45:19 47:8,12  
47:21,24 48:10 49:19 50:2  
50:8 54:3,18 55:1,11 57:3  
57:15 58:9 59:13,18 60:4  
61:17 62:3 63:9,24 64:3  
July [12] 5:6,8 6:6 13:3  
18:20 22:6 24:1,2 40:19  
60:12 61:1 62:6  
jump [1] 17:25  
jumping [1] 60:20  
June [1] 40:19

-K-

Kathleen [10] 2:23 4:8  
6:3 32:5 38:16 39:4 44:5  
46:21 48:24 50:17  
keep [3] 15:15 59:24  
64:16  
keeping [1] 14:2  
keeps [1] 35:2  
Kelly [5] 3:8 4:9 39:6  
55:13 56:22  
Ken [1] 2:17  
Kennedy [1] 65:22  
Kettell [5] 2:18,18 6:16  
63:1,2  
kicking [1] 56:9  
kind [8] 17:18 23:14  
27:11 28:11 33:24 37:21  
50:22 57:22  
knowledge [1] 26:6

-L-

large [1] 55:15  
larger [2] 9:2 46:2  
last [4] 28:25 30:24 31:11  
34:6  
late [3] 42:2,2,21  
LaValle [46] 2:23,23 6:3  
6:4,8 12:12 15:1 17:16  
19:9,21 20:24 22:19 23:4  
23:12 27:25 28:4,10 29:23  
30:2 31:11 32:3,8,14 33:1  
34:12 38:16,16 39:5 44:5  
44:6 45:22 46:22 47:5,20  
48:5,14,25 49:3 50:10,19  
51:3,19 53:2 54:4,12  
63:12  
LAW [1] 1:15  
lead [1] 4:5  
learned [2] 35:12 36:11  
least [8] 19:10,22 28:17  
32:11,23 37:20 38:18  
47:25  
leaving [1] 26:20  
led [2] 19:8 44:9

left [3] 3:25 50:5,9  
less [2] 7:3 47:18  
letter [1] 27:6  
level [3] 8:25 10:13 48:19  
line [4] 6:21 20:8 21:7  
64:7  
lines [1] 20:7  
Lisa [4] 2:15 6:15 7:7  
27:15  
list [17] 6:18 7:12 11:10  
14:7 15:16,18 19:6 20:2  
20:14,14,19 21:11,14 32:9  
35:4 36:5 58:18  
listed [1] 20:22  
listing [1] 23:14  
live [2] 33:17 49:11  
LNP [1] 53:15  
LOC [7] 36:15,18 38:12  
49:23 52:21 59:6,8

local [5] 4:23,23 41:10  
41:11 46:18  
log [1] 42:1  
longer [1] 61:9  
look [26] 4:21 5:3,6,8 6:6  
6:17 10:22 11:23 12:25  
13:3 16:21 17:3 20:2  
21:22 29:12,23 30:20  
35:13,15 45:23 51:1,11  
51:17 52:12 53:8 63:25  
looked [2] 19:13,23  
looking [15] 5:4,14,21  
7:4,12 9:9,19 11:9 14:6  
20:8 30:18 33:16 51:15  
52:22 54:9  
looks [2] 10:9 58:14  
loop [6] 4:22 30:9 39:25  
40:4 53:14,15  
loops [1] 9:9  
Lori [4] 2:20 6:15 24:11  
32:6  
loss [3] 6:19,20,21  
Lou [3] 1:16 65:5,20  
Louisiana [1] 43:11  
LSC [5] 36:16,19 38:13  
52:21 59:7  
LSR [5] 7:25 8:6 40:7,20  
53:18  
LTG [1] 21:6  
lumping [1] 13:24

-M-

MAC [1] 20:25  
maintenance [1] 57:1  
maintenance-type [2]  
11:3 14:12  
majority [1] 47:24  
managers [1] 37:18  
manual [8] 18:19 20:14  
20:25 21:1 41:9 42:1  
63:18,20  
mark [3] 3:5 8:18 49:24  
materials [1] 26:20

matrix [8] 7:15 11:21,24  
12:16 28:25 29:4 32:18  
43:14  
matter [2] 1:12 65:7  
maturity [3] 46:3 48:7  
48:23  
may [28] 13:5,5 14:11  
16:17,22 18:15 19:8,19  
19:20 21:4 30:19 32:22  
33:1 37:5 39:12,22 40:1,2  
40:5,14,14,18,18,22,22  
41:14,15 42:20  
mean [2] 21:12 50:23  
means [2] 33:3,5  
meant [1] 32:20  
measure [9] 38:20 40:1  
41:20,21 42:23 43:18  
62:10,22,25  
measurement [2] 39:10  
39:11  
measurements [3]  
43:15,25 44:4  
measures [19] 37:10  
38:24 39:1,17,23 40:10  
40:23 41:16 42:11 43:6  
44:9,12,14 45:4,13 53:22  
53:25 56:8 57:13  
mechanized [1] 18:19  
meet [3] 8:2 34:15 36:17  
meeting [19] 4:11 18:1  
20:13 25:25 28:18 41:23  
42:21,24 51:23 52:7,8  
55:20 56:7,11,14,23 57:2  
57:16,18  
meetings [4] 24:14 43:17  
56:20 57:9  
members [1] 5:1  
mention [1] 57:8  
mentioned [4] 21:6  
49:10 59:23 60:3  
Mesa [3] 4:22 8:24 9:10  
method [1] 40:8  
Michelle [3] 2:25 55:13  
56:22  
mid-August [1] 61:2  
mid-July [1] 59:23  
middle [1] 60:22  
might [7] 11:12 29:4,9  
30:4 48:11,12 52:1  
mind [2] 6:2 58:3  
mindful [1] 42:18  
mine [1] 35:5  
mini [1] 30:19  
minimize [1] 49:12  
minutes [3] 50:5,7,8  
misnumber [1] 29:21  
missed [1] 40:18  
missing [2] 54:9,17  
MLT [3] 49:23 55:5 59:1  
modified [1] 31:7  
MOG [2] 15:18 17:6  
month [3] 7:5 31:4,9

morass [1] 13:25  
most [5] 21:10,10 35:5  
42:14 52:25  
move [4] 29:19 52:8,10  
61:10  
moved [2] 29:7 30:10  
movement [2] 5:6 29:24  
moving [11] 29:2 35:2  
44:1,2 51:2,8,11,13,18  
52:1 55:11  
MS [117] 2:15,20,21,23  
2:25 3:4,8,20,22,23 6:3,8  
6:11,13 9:6,14,25 10:2,4  
10:14 11:8 12:12 13:7,17  
14:5 15:1,21 16:3 17:8,16  
17:19 18:9,17 19:9,21  
20:5,24 22:18,19 23:4,12  
24:2,24 26:2,13 27:2,17  
27:25 28:4,9,10,22 29:15  
29:23 30:2,24 31:11,21  
32:3,6,8,10,14 33:1,11,25  
34:12,24 35:7 36:3,13  
37:4 38:1,7,8,16 39:3,5,6  
42:6 43:12 44:5 45:22  
46:22 47:5,20 48:5,14,25  
49:3 50:10,17,19,20 51:3  
51:10,19 53:2,12 54:4,11  
54:12,20,22 55:3,10 56:6  
57:5,10 58:3,20 61:4,15  
62:11 63:6,11,12

Mullin [2] 3:4,4  
multi-color [2] 7:15  
12:16  
Murray [13] 3:8,8 9:14  
10:2,14 31:21 39:3,6,6  
43:12 50:17,20 51:10  
mutually [1] 7:1

-N-

N [8] 2:1 7:21 11:21 16:12  
23:18 24:9 25:7 57:17  
name [2] 2:10 63:22  
names [1] 2:12  
Nancy [17] 3:22 6:13  
9:12 13:10 16:2 17:25  
18:16 22:1,14 24:10,18  
27:14 28:21 31:12 32:5  
57:7,20  
near [1] 56:21  
nearing [1] 64:4  
necessarily [1] 36:9  
necessary [2] 13:2 35:24  
need [16] 9:3 12:2 16:4  
17:5 20:2 33:2 35:18,20  
37:22 38:2 49:11 53:22  
55:22 56:2 57:5 61:14  
needs [5] 11:23 12:8  
37:18 53:1 61:21  
negatively [1] 17:7  
never [1] 11:6  
new [1] 64:5  
next [19] 4:1 6:9 18:1  
20:13 21:20 23:20 25:25  
26:17 27:3,9,18 32:12  
33:6,22 42:25 55:15 56:12

56:17,23  
no-dial-tone [2] 7:3,5  
non-5E [1] 31:4  
none [1] 61:23  
North [1] 1:13  
notes [7] 16:9 20:22  
27:19 32:11 58:12,21  
65:14  
nothing [2] 7:10 64:17  
notice [1] 37:9  
notification [1] 36:18  
notified [1] 42:21  
now [3] 9:10 24:25 32:5  
number [9] 7:1 8:13  
21:10 40:5 43:16 46:18  
48:16 51:15 58:12  
numbers [3] 7:3 27:16  
60:5

**-O-**

O [1] 2:1  
obviously [2] 30:3 45:17  
occur [2] 25:15 35:18  
occurred [2] 35:11 65:8  
occurrence [3] 28:11  
30:5 31:9  
occurring [1] 4:22  
October [7] 40:9 44:23  
53:25 54:7 63:8,14,19  
off [13] 4:5,8 11:13 29:2,8  
29:25 30:10 40:2 43:5  
50:21 56:9 64:6,17  
off-line [2] 10:20 11:1  
office [3] 29:19 50:4,14  
offices [1] 46:8  
often [2] 21:11 46:23  
on-going [1] 57:24  
one [45] 8:10 11:22 13:22  
20:9 21:15,16 24:3,7,13  
24:24 25:20 27:10,18  
28:23 29:10 30:14,18,19  
31:11 33:22 35:24 37:13  
37:19 39:3 42:9 44:12  
46:4,12 49:19 50:12 52:3  
54:8 55:5 56:21 57:11  
58:25 59:20,20 62:4,19  
62:19,22,25 63:24 64:4  
ones [3] 55:24 56:1 62:12  
onto [2] 21:7 30:10  
onus [1] 11:16  
Oops [1] 25:23  
open [4] 22:20 42:9,20  
58:24  
operation [1] 4:25  
operational [2] 1:6  
37:23  
operations [3] 4:23  
41:11 57:22  
opinion [1] 13:21  
opportunities [1] 58:7  
opposed [2] 13:23 53:18

orally [1] 55:21  
order [20] 7:22 17:2 20:3  
20:20 21:4 23:18,24,25  
24:5 28:15 34:14 35:21  
36:16 37:9 40:16,17 41:13  
51:14 53:9 54:9  
ordered [1] 11:4  
ordering [1] 11:5  
orders [23] 4:22 7:20 8:7  
11:22 12:19 16:13 28:7  
35:8 36:5 40:5,11 45:24  
46:18,24 48:17 53:15,16  
60:17 61:1 62:8,17 63:18  
63:21  
ordinary [1] 44:25  
organization [1] 11:6  
original [2] 22:25 65:14  
otherwise [1] 45:5  
ought [1] 9:8  
ours [1] 57:11  
outage [6] 12:13,20 29:2  
30:5 38:22 45:25  
outages [18] 5:21 6:18  
7:1 8:11 10:4,9,22,23 11:3  
11:18 12:1 14:8 18:13,17  
23:21 29:12 34:4 56:10  
oversee [1] 9:12  
overseer [2] 9:4,5  
overseers [1] 8:20

**-P-**

P [1] 2:1  
p.m [3] 1:10 2:3 64:20  
Pacific [1] 17:11  
Page [1] 29:1  
pages [1] 65:13  
pair [2] 29:3,8  
pairs [1] 8:9  
paper [4] 24:13,17 25:2  
25:20  
Paragraph [1] 43:10  
parallel [1] 33:24  
parameters [1] 49:9  
Parrish [1] 6:16  
part [6] 6:22 13:5,22 23:7  
44:2 49:19  
participating [1] 6:15  
particular [16] 11:14  
14:10,14 16:8,13 22:9  
39:2 44:19 46:5 47:3,17  
52:7,8 56:14 57:2 62:17  
particularly [3] 41:4,8  
43:9  
parties [8] 5:7 40:25  
45:16 49:7 52:11 55:14  
55:17 60:15  
party [1] 49:6  
passed [2] 60:2 62:12  
passing [1] 22:13  
past [2] 40:16 58:15  
Pat [2] 3:2 41:18

Paul [6] 2:13 4:5 27:25  
30:25 32:15 59:15  
pending [2] 23:15 40:9  
people [6] 4:2 8:14 11:13  
14:12 20:23 39:14  
per [1] 37:5  
perceived [1] 43:4  
percent [5] 7:4,5 46:17  
47:1,19  
percentage [1] 46:8  
performance [28] 37:10  
38:19,24 39:1,10,11,17  
39:23 40:1,10,19,23 41:15  
42:23 43:6,15,18,24 44:4  
44:8,12,14 45:11,13 53:22  
56:8 57:12 62:10  
perhaps [2] 9:13 32:22  
person [1] 27:15  
personal [1] 13:21  
personnel [1] 4:13  
perspective [4] 6:19  
25:3 29:7 62:25  
Phil [1] 6:15  
phrase [2] 32:17,22  
physically [1] 29:19  
piece [3] 11:5 24:13 25:1  
pinpoint [1] 25:13  
pitch [1] 26:22  
place [19] 9:19 17:10,23  
19:19 21:23 22:6,14,23  
29:10 33:24 34:2 36:23  
37:2 40:9 49:25 50:3  
51:16 58:6 62:23  
plan [1] 57:21  
plans [1] 21:23  
plenty [1] 28:3  
point [10] 7:15 8:16 19:9  
25:5,11 37:13 42:4 52:19  
61:11 63:1  
pointed [2] 43:14,22  
points [3] 44:11 53:3  
58:11  
policy [3] 30:11 36:20  
36:21  
populate [1] 62:14  
populated [1] 16:15  
portability [2] 40:5  
46:18  
portion [1] 6:14  
position [1] 54:6  
possibility [2] 52:5,10  
possibly [1] 49:9  
post [7] 19:11,23 23:21  
28:7,8,15 44:25  
posted [1] 45:10  
posting [2] 28:12,15  
pot [1] 11:10  
potential [1] 30:5  
potentially [3] 5:7,13  
8:9  
pre-order [4] 7:24 10:18  
10:24 12:6

precision [1] 32:23  
predominantly [2]  
47:16,18  
preference [1] 49:14  
premature [1] 41:23  
premise [3] 22:25 23:5,9  
prepared [4] 39:15 42:17  
45:20,25  
presentation [1] 31:23  
previous [1] 34:3  
Princeton [1] 57:14  
proactive [1] 36:1  
Proactively [1] 50:6  
problem [9] 14:22 19:2  
27:21 36:14 38:15 46:2  
52:8 53:7 61:3  
problems [9] 6:20 20:4  
27:23 28:12 30:20 32:18  
34:3 38:23 49:16  
procedure [1] 42:24  
procedures [1] 16:7  
proceedings [6] 1:1,8  
1:16 43:17 64:19 65:9  
process [35] 5:15,17,22  
7:22 13:16 18:18,19 22:24  
24:21 28:16 33:14,14,16  
33:17 34:2,9,16 37:7  
39:25 43:3 44:21 45:2,15  
46:4,9,24 49:8,20 50:15  
56:18 58:5 59:5,12 60:17  
64:10  
processed [4] 7:21 31:20  
48:16,20  
processes [5] 5:18 26:4  
43:16 44:13 51:16  
processing [2] 46:10,15  
production [1] 35:1  
productive [2] 25:2  
64:16  
Project [1] 60:8  
proper [1] 59:12  
proposed [2] 40:12 45:2  
provide [13] 10:13 15:4  
15:17 16:19 17:18 20:14  
20:19 21:3,17 31:16 34:17  
35:19 48:21  
provided [6] 15:10 18:24  
24:2 35:10 53:10 54:13  
provider [1] 7:9  
provides [1] 52:24  
providing [1] 5:12  
provisioning [9] 38:23  
39:24,25 40:4,6,11,12  
53:7 59:6  
provisions [1] 30:22  
Public [2] 1:3,12  
PUC [1] 2:13  
pull [1] 28:6  
pulled [2] 8:7 16:25  
pulling [1] 8:3  
purely [1] 14:14  
purpose [1] 9:24

purposes [2] 51:8,11  
put [14] 4:10 17:1,10,21  
22:6,13 24:11 25:1,9 29:9  
40:9 52:15 59:22 62:23  
putting [3] 2:5 24:17  
33:17

**-Q-**

quantification [1]  
27:12  
quantify [2] 7:1 12:3  
query [2] 40:8,15  
questions [6] 26:11  
39:11,18,21 40:24 41:7  
questions/concerns  
[1] 39:20  
queuing [1] 62:6  
quickly [1] 58:23  
quoting [1] 7:2

**-R-**

R [2] 2:1 65:1  
raise [1] 30:4  
raised [6] 38:18 39:1  
45:13 46:6 51:20 53:21  
raising [1] 39:12  
range [2] 28:14 29:12  
rather [9] 11:3 34:15 40:3  
40:7,17 41:10 48:10 59:7  
60:14  
raw [2] 53:23,24  
Ray [3] 1:16 65 5,20  
RCMAC [3] 20 14,19  
21:5  
read [2] 4:8 40 23  
reading [1] 59 14  
real [1] 53:5  
realize [3] 25 22,23 26:5  
really [7] 8:25 9 15 10:20  
22:1 33:4 44:15 50 12  
reason [4] 17 1 29 1  
30:23 44:2  
reasons [1] 20 25  
reassigned [1] 8 10  
Rebecca [4] 2 21 27 19  
33:7 37:16  
receive [3] 40 21 53 24  
60:13  
receiving [3] 6 22 27 21  
36:15  
recent [2] 15 18 24 9  
recited [1] 41 20  
recognize [1] 17 3  
recognized [1] 29 3  
Recognizing [1] 49 10  
recollection [1] 21 2  
record [13] 2 5 5 10 12  
4:10 17:21 22 22 23 14  
23:15 48:13 50 21 25 5  
64:18  
records [4] 22 12 25 12

<p>61:9 rectify (1) 11:5 reduced (1) 65:11 redundant (1) 32:15 reeducate (1) 59:11 reference (2) 43:10 46:20 referring (3) 37:17 59:7 60:5 reflected (2) 40:19 41:15 refresh (1) 20:23 regression (2) 21:23 22:15 regular (1) 9:18 regularly (1) 38:6 reissue (1) 35:20 reject (3) 34:14,21 60:14 rejected (1) 41:13 related (7) 8:8 19:20,23 21:24 23:18,21 35:6 relating (6) 1:6 40:8,20 41:6,7,13 relative (4) 2:8 10:18 23:13 37:13 release (5) 44:23 60:18 63:8,13,19 rely (1) 53:16 remain (1) 20:20 remains (1) 43:2 remember (4) 30:13,15 36:9 61:18 <b>REMEMBERED</b> (1) 1:10 reoccurring (1) 61:6 repair (1) 57:1 repeatedly (1) 39:8 reply (2) 43:12,13 report (10) 26:23 28:20 45:3 46:11 48:15,17 51:6 57:4,6 60:9 reported (8) 1:16 24:5 38:25 40:15 41:3,25 51:22 65:10 Reporter (3) 1:17 65:6 65:21 Reporting (1) 65:22 represented (2) 5:24 23:1 request (6) 37:14 44:9 45:7,10 48:23 54:4 requested (5) 31:7 34:15 36:17 40:16 53:25 requesting (1) 62:15 requests (4) 36:15 41:9 45:4,5 resale (4) 18:25 61:11,22 61:25 research (1) 18:14 resell (1) 61:20 resold (1) 22:3 resolution (4) 1:5 2:6,7</p>	<p>38:15 resolve (3) 17:4,14 18:8 resources (3) 10:12 52:22,23 - respects (1) 44:1 respond (1) 39:15 response (5) 15:4,8 31:15 31:16 46:13 responsible (1) 27:20 result (2) 18:18 29:2 resulted (2) 10:23 34:4 results (1) 51:12 retail (8) 28:16 31:18 32:1 56:4 61:21,23 62:1 64:1 retraining (2) 36:23 60:21 review (7) 5:14 12:16 19:6 44:3 50:16 53:5 54:15 revisit (1) 9:8 revisiting (1) 53:14 right (15) 10:11,13 14:9 17:19 21:25 24:15,23 25:8 33:25 36:13 37:6 46:19 50:1 54:11,21 risk (1) 33:18 root (26) 7:17,19 8:11 10:5 11:12,17,22 12:1,2,14,25 14:15 16:14 19:3 24:1 28:23 29:5,6 55:23,25 56:1,2,10,13,16,25 route (1) 31:7 routed (1) 31:6 routing (1) 31:3 Royer (1) 8:19 rule (1) 63:14 rules (1) 43:8 run (1) 39:17 rural (3) 31:12,22,24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">-S-</p> <hr/> <p>S (1) 2:1 sales (1) 26:21 Sarah (7) 3:23 9:6 13:11 16:2 33:7,12 49:10 Sarah's (1) 8:19 saw (4) 16:21,23 33:15 34:3 scenarios (1) 30:21 scheduled (5) 18:1 56:11 56:21,23 57:12 scope (1) 9:11 scrawling (1) 18:12 seal (1) 65:16 Second (1) 43:11 see (15) 7:17 13:14,24 16:22 20:3 21:18 27:5 29:24 34:8 45:9 49:24 55:8,14 56:16 63:25 seeing (3) 27:20 41:4</p>	<p>55:22 seek (1) 45:9 seem (1) 32:10 send (2) 7:25 8:6 sending (1) 22:2 sent (3) 22:4 59:24 62:8 separate (2) 12:5,12 September (9) 1:9,11 2:2 5:5,11 24:3 60:7 62:13 65:16 series (1) 4:7 serious (1) 43:2 service (18) 4:24 5:21 8:11 10:4 11:4 12:11,13 12:19 24:4 30:5 38:22 41:4,10 45:24 54:9 60:10 60:17 65:22 set (13) 4:12,21 8:17 9:9 18:7 42:15,24 55:12,15 57:19 61:18 65:8,16 sets (1) 56:20 setting (1) 19:14 several (1) 30:17 shall (1) 6:2 share (1) 25:10 sharing (1) 25:4 Sharon (1) 3:4 Sheila (1) 8:22 shook (1) 42:6 Shorthand (3) 1:17 65:5 65:21 side (6) 31:18 32:1 35:21 56:4 62:19 64:1 sides (4) 5:1,2,15 14:16 Siegel (5) 1:14 2:4,11 4:1 8:12 9:3 14:16 21:9 21:18 23:3,7,17 24:7 25:19 26:8,10 29:13 30:8 32:24 34:23 35:1,5,22 36:8 37:1 38:3 39:16 45:19 47:8,12,21,24 48:10 49:19 50:2,8 54:3,18 55:1 55:11 57:3,15 58:9 59:13 59:18 60:4 61:17 62:3 63:9,24 64:3 similar (3) 14:18 19:7 34:9 Similarly (1) 38:10 simple (1) 33:19 simply (1) 39:14 sitting (1) 33:13 situation (3) 7:3 8:8 60:25 situations (1) 8:9 six (3) 21:11 58:16,16 six-month (1) 44:3 SLC (3) 29:17 30:18,21 slow (2) 13:15 14:19 small (1) 63:23 SMEs (2) 39:10 42:23 SOC (2) 23:21 53:19 SOCs (1) 54:16</p>	<p>software (1) 61:2 someone (4) 12:8 26:3 49:23 62:1 sorry (3) 10:3 60:7,19 sort (1) 36:18 sourced (1) 23:5 Southwest (1) 23:22 Southwester (1) 45:15 Southwestern (9) 3:7 3:9,11,13,15,17,19,21 4:3 4:12,19 5:22 7:2,8 8:2,16 10:7,9,16 11:24 12:17,17 12:23 13:9 15:3,11,17 16:5,11,17 17:17 18:14 18:20 19:5,11 20:7,12,17 21:21 22:2,23 24:14,17 25:3,10,18 26:5,21,23,25 27:4,13,22 28:6,19 31:15 32:15 34:13 35:9,19,23 36:16,20,21 37:8,12 38:9 38:22 39:7 41:22,25 42:22 43:13 44:16,24 45:8 46:7 46:11 48:3,19 49:13 50:12 52:9,14 53:3,7,9,13,23 54:6,13,14 58:14 61:19 62:15,15,21 63:3,15 speak (1) 26:22 SPEAKER (1) 8:22 special (1) 45:3 specific (13) 9:24 12:20 15:4 18:25 26:24 27:22 28:24 33:4 34:10 44:23 53:6 59:3,16 specifically (5) 6:1 21:24 22:1 29:11 44:17 specifics (1) 14:23 spent (1) 24:8 square (1) 22:25 staff (4) 2:14 42:19 52:25 55:16 stamped (1) 40:2 standard (4) 40:21 45:7 53:14,17 standpoint (1) 42:18 Starks (1) 6:16 start (6) 5:11 13:24 40:2 41:25 42:12 59:21 started (1) 63:10 starting (2) 7:14 25:5 starts (1) 42:2 state (4) 38:25 49:7 65:3 65:6 statement (4) 38:21 47:11,13 50:11 statements (1) 39:13 static (1) 6:20 status (3) 55:20 57:4,6 steps (3) 56:12,17,24 still (7) 31:6 35:17 55:25 56:1 62:9 63:16,18 stops (1) 37:25 stuff (1) 10:19 subject (2) 23:6 42:25</p>	<p>subset (1) 63:23 successful (1) 48:18 such (3) 21:14 43:20 65:10 sufficiently (1) 43:19 suggest (1) 9:11 suggestion (1) 32:21 suggestions (1) 64:7 Suite (1) 65:22 summarize (1) 24:25 summarized (2) 42:14 58:21 summary (3) 1:8 2:5 15:13 supervision (2) 65:11 65:12 supp (3) 36:16 40:16,17 supplement (2) 6:11 61:4 <b>SUPPORT</b> (1) 1:7 supps (1) 37:14 suspect (1) 24:4 suspicions (1) 11:19 swallow (1) 14:19 switch (1) 31:8 switches (1) 31:4 system (3) 9:19 16:17 17:2 systems (3) 1:7 7:24 26:4</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">-T-</p> <hr/> <p>T (2) 65:1,1 table (1) 60:5 takes (3) 14:2 28:14 42:12 taking (1) 37:2 target (1) 44:2 task (28) 4:11,15,20,24 5:13,21 6:1,23 7:14 8:13 9:16,18,23 10:6 12:18 13:1,5,12,15,22 14:7,11 14:19 15:2 35:14 56:9 57:8,10 team (17) 8:19,20 9:1,17 10:7,21 11:1,17,23 12:5 14:3,3 15:12 30:20 56:11 57:20,20 teams (3) 5:1 13:13 58:1 technical (3) 8:2 11:17 14:12 technician (3) 42:1 50:14 51:5 technicians (1) 60:22 Telephone (1) 18:14 terms (9) 10:24 19:13 21:11 44:7 46:14 47:6 50:23 51:22 55:21 Terry (1) 3:24 test (2) 33:16 49:23 testing (3) 21:23 33:10 63:9 Texas (11) 1:3,4,13,14</p>
--	--	---	---	--

<p>46:8,12 48:3,6 65:3,6,23  <b>thank</b> [4] 16:3 25:3 60:11          62:3  <b>therefore</b> [1] 12:1  <b>they've</b> [2] 48:15 58:19  <b>thinking</b> [2] 24:9 59:15  <b>third</b> [1] 57:8  <b>thought</b> [10] 10:8 12:20          17:25 19:21 21:16 24:7          42:3 46:24 47:6 49:20  <b>three</b> [6] 33:23 37:4,15          56:20,20 57:9  <b>three-day</b> [3] 40:12,13          44:22  <b>through</b> [24] 4:14,16 5:7          5:8,25 7:14 9:17 15:12          17:5 23:5,16,25 25:22          27:11 31:24 33:15 39:17          46:9 49:8 50:13,22 56:15          58:1,23  <b>Thursday</b> [1] 42:21  <b>ticket</b> [2] 11:9 41:9  <b>tickets</b> [6] 7:13 10:5          11:11 15:5,9 41:8  <b>times</b> [2] 37:4,15  <b>TM</b> [1] 35:6  <b>today</b> [33] 5:20 6:17 7:13          7:16,20 9:1 11:19,20,25          12:16,18 13:4,6 15:22          17:18 24:8,20 25:2,4,5          26:7 36:5 39:9 41:23          42:18 44:7,10 46:8 52:21          54:6,19 57:24 59:4  <b>together</b> [3] 51:6 55:13          58:4  <b>toll</b> [2] 31:2,6  <b>Tom</b> [17] 3:16 4:14,18          8:15 9:12 13:8 14:6 16:10          17:15 18:24 20:16 24:2          26:10 34:8 56:22 59:13          61:12  <b>tomorrow</b> [7] 4:16 5:10          5:24 16:2 18:2 56:9 57:11  <b>tone</b> [1] 6:20  <b>took</b> [2] 8:1 20:18  <b>tools</b> [1] 58:6  <b>top</b> [1] 21:11  <b>topics</b> [1] 44:10  <b>total</b> [4] 46:17 47:6,9,19  <b>touch</b> [1] 17:22  <b>touching</b> [1] 30:4  <b>tracking</b> [1] 36:2  <b>TRANSCRIPT</b> [1] 1:1  <b>transcription</b> [1] 65:14  <b>transmission</b> [1] 53:18  <b>TRAVIS</b> [1] 65:3  <b>trends</b> [1] 14:8  <b>trial</b> [8] 34:4 45:14,17          48:18 49:5,9,21 51:1  <b>tried</b> [2] 15:11 46:3  <b>trigger</b> [3] 18:13,18 20:8  <b>triggers</b> [1] 19:14</p>	<p><b>Trimmier</b> [4] 3:14,14          15:19,23  <b>trouble</b> [8] 10:5,10 11:9          11:11 15:5,9 41:8,9  <b>true</b> [4] 11:2 29:5 47:10          65:13  <b>true-up</b> [2] 7:10 27:12  <b>truing</b> [1] 27:16  <b>try</b> [12] 6:17 8:4 17:21          18:5 24:25 25:13 28:6          35:16,24 49:8 57:17 64:11  <b>trying</b> [5] 28:10 41:2 48:7          51:8 64:13  <b>Tuesday</b> [3] 1:9,11 2:2  <b>two</b> [17] 10:12 19:22 22:1          24:24 25:21 28:22 35:23          35:25 37:3,4,15 41:1          44:11,15 46:5 53:4 62:18  <b>type</b> [1] 12:6  <b>types</b> [1] 9:20  <b>typewritten</b> [1] 65:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-U-</b></p> <p><b>unclear</b> [1] 55:25  <b>under</b> [2] 65:10,12  <b>understand</b> [7] 30:7          35:17 36:20 44:7 45:8          46:6 54:5  <b>understood</b> [4] 10:21          43:6 46:16 56:6  <b>underway</b> [1] 57:1  <b>undone</b> [2] 22:10,16  <b>UNE</b> [8] 4:21 9:9 10:9          32:18 39:25 53:14,15          61:11  <b>UNE-L</b> [11] 6:6 10:10          28:1 29:7 30:9 41:5 43:9          44:22 46:17 47:7 55:2  <b>UNE-P</b> [23] 5:21,22 6:14          6:19 9:5 10:10 12:19 13:4          18:25 22:4 29:10,21 30:2          30:12,22,25 38:11 41:6          61:1,20,21,25 62:2  <b>UNIDEN</b> [1] 8:22  <b>universal</b> [1] 30:11  <b>universe</b> [2] 47:22,23  <b>unnamed</b> [1] 31:18  <b>unnumbered</b> [1] 31:19  <b>unrelated</b> [1] 23:24  <b>unspecified</b> [1] 31:19  <b>up</b> [24] 4:12,21,24 8:18 9:9          11:5 13:12 14:2,19 22:25          27:16 30:13 37:18 38:11          39:18 42:20,24 49:8 55:12          55:15 57:19 58:11 59:10          61:18  <b>update</b> [3] 23:15,15 27:6  <b>updated</b> [2] 22:21 27:21  <b>updates</b> [1] 22:9  <b>used</b> [3] 7:16 32:17,22  <b>useful</b> [1] 43:21  <b>user</b> [1] 62:1</p>	<p><b>users</b> [4] 17:6 22:5 49:12          59:25  <b>using</b> [1] 34:13  <b>usual</b> [2] 32:20 33:3  <b>Utility</b> [2] 1:3,12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-V-</b></p> <p><b>validate</b> [1] 61:6  <b>validated</b> [1] 31:5  <b>validation</b> [3] 10:19,25          25:11  <b>Van</b> [1] 8:18  <b>varies</b> [1] 27:14  <b>verify</b> [1] 29:20  <b>version</b> [3] 42:20 55:7          59:2  <b>versus</b> [5] 10:10 16:16          28:16 46:5 51:21  <b>viewed</b> [1] 43:18  <b>volume</b> [9] 21:12 46:14          46:23 47:7,9,25 48:19          51:22 52:6  <b>volumes</b> [4] 47:13 48:5          52:23 62:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-W-</b></p> <p><b>ways</b> [1] 33:16  <b>website</b> [1] 45:1  <b>Wednesday</b> [3] 4:13          18:1 20:9  <b>week</b> [8] 5:13 20:9 37:5          37:16 41:1,2 43:1 55:15  <b>weekly</b> [1] 37:19  <b>weeks</b> [2] 53:4 58:16  <b>wherein</b> [1] 45:3  <b>WHEREOF</b> [1] 65:15  <b>wherewithal</b> [1] 14:13  <b>whole</b> [1] 45:23  <b>wholeheartedly</b> [1]          63:22  <b>wholesale</b> [1] 56:4  <b>willing</b> [2] 31:16 33:9  <b>wiring</b> [1] 27:22  <b>Witcher</b> [2] 3:5,5  <b>within</b> [6] 25:14,14 31:20          47:14,25 50:7  <b>without</b> [1] 33:17  <b>WITNESS</b> [1] 65:15  <b>words</b> [1] 42:15  <b>worked</b> [3] 23:24 45:20          52:14  <b>works</b> [3] 51:12,17 64:10  <b>world</b> [2] 28:16 35:2  <b>written</b> [1] 21:21  <b>wrong</b> [1] 46:25</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-X-</b></p> <p><b>X</b> [1] 21:10  <b>XYZ</b> [1] 25:15</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>-Y-</b></p> <p><b>y'all</b> [3] 4:3 37:17 57:16  <b>yesterday</b> [4] 42:22          54:20 59:10 63:10  <b>yet</b> [2] 6:25 48:18  <b>you-all</b> [2] 17:20,21</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>-Z-</b></p> <p><b>zero</b> [3] 22:4 31:5 59:24</p>	
---	--	---	---	--

**REPLY DECLARATION OF  
NANCY DALTON and SARAH DEYOUNG  
ON  
BEHALF OF AT&T CORP.**

**ATTACHMENT 13**

# Accessible



## **“Minutes from January 27, 2000 CLEC User Forum Conference Call – Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas”**

Date: February 7, 2000

Number: **CLEC00-036**

Contact: Southwestern Bell Account Manager

This Accessible Letter serves to distribute the Minutes from the CLEC User Forum conference call held on January 27th. In the attachments you will find the following:

- ◆ Minutes
- ◆ Participants List
- ◆ Agenda
- ◆ Generic User ID” Trial Guidelines & Responsibilities document
- ◆ Access Form
- ◆ Draft CLEC User Forum Guidelines
- ◆ Action Item Log

Please direct any questions to your Account Manager.

Attachments

# **SWBT CLEC User Forum**

## **Conference Call**

**Thursday, January 27, 2000 ~ 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM**

### **Welcome and Introductions**

SBC opened the meeting with a roll call of all conference call participants. A list of participants is included as Attachment 1 to these minutes. This is a follow-up meeting to those held in December 1999 on the 7<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup>.

SBC reviewed the agenda items identified during previous CLEC Users Forums. The agenda is included as Attachment 2 to these minutes.

### **USER ID UPDATE:**

SBC reported on the status of the trial for issuance of User IDs as follows:

1. The User ID Trial Team, consisting of SBC (IS Call Center and CIS departments) and CLEC volunteers, Birch Telecom, KMC Telecom and MCI WorldCom met on January 10<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup>.
2. Developed CLEC "Generic User ID" Trial Guidelines & Responsibilities document (included at Attachment 3). Sprint asked if this document would be posted on the CLEC web site. SBC responded that after a successful trial, a final document would be available on the web.
3. Identified and currently working through action items needed to make the trial and new process possible. Birch asked if there were any open issues/action items identified during the meetings to develop the Guidelines & Responsibilities document. SBC responded that all issues have been addressed and that the open action items are being worked.
4. Agreed that it is the responsibility of each CLEC to work with its Account Manager to ensure that the CLEC profile is current and the applications listed are accurate.
5. Created Access Form (included as Attachment 4).
6. Access Forms will be submitted to the IS Call Center.
7. CLECs may designate up to four CLEC Security Administrators (CSAs).
8. CSAs will have responsibility for maintaining their company's User IDs.
9. CSAs will be able to request User IDs in blocks, up to a maximum of 250 per request, designated on the request form. The CLEC's initial request of IDs will be compared against the current number of active users (plus 20 to 25 percent), for verification of reasonableness with the CLEC. McLeod asked if additional space on a block of IDs can be accommodated. SBC responded that it would work with individual CLECs based on the need.
10. Set-up response time will be about what it is today, but each CLEC will have greater flexibility with the number of IDs available through the block method. A question was raised regarding what applications would be available. SBC responded that the applications currently available will be available for the new process, there is no change from the current procedure.

11. Information will not be on the web during the trial phase, but CLECs will be kept apprised of the status during the CLEC User Forums. Account Managers remain the CLEC contact.
12. The new block system would completely replace the existing request system within the CLEC community.
13. This change will be evaluated during the 2-month trial period and any concerns will be addressed as they occur with trial participants.
14. If the trial runs well, CLECs are OK with implementing this procedure for the entire CLEC community.
15. GTE asked if there would be sufficient activity during the trial period to validate the effectiveness of this procedure. MCI Worldcom and Birch volunteer participants stated that there would be sufficient activity during the trial to validate results.
16. SBC would like a general consensus from all CLECs on the principles of the trial prior to moving forward with testing the process for the three trial participants.
17. At the end of the trial, SBC will communicate the results of the trial via Accessible Letter. SBC stated that once this change in the process is made, the new process will apply to all CLECs. SBC will not be able to support both the current and new processes.

#### **BROADCAST FAXES**

Birch asked about the status of migrating from the Broadcast Fax to email notification. SBC responded that it is in the process of evaluating the possibility of moving to email notifications. Internal meetings were held with the group responsible for such notifications. SBC will advise the responsible group of the importance of making this change a priority for the CLEC community.

SBC stated that if it is determined that migrating from the Broadcast Fax to email notification is possible, it will send an announcement of this change via Accessible Letter to notify all CLECs. This will provide the CLEC community an opportunity to respond with questions and concerns before implementing the change. There may be a possibility that some CLECs may not be able to handle email notifications.

#### **RELATED SERVICE ORDER PROCESSING UPDATE**

SBC provided status updates on the following:

##### **Address Validation Edits:**

##### **Incorrect Address on LSR**

Long Term: Address validation edit proposed in CMP and documented in Accessible Letter CLECSS00-008. This edit will compare the Service Address Number (SANO), Building (BLDG), Floor (FLR) and Room (RM) End User Address entries on the LSR to these values on the Customer Service Record (CSR). If a match is not made, the LSR will be returned with a FATAL error SD2160.

Birch expressed concern that this edit would not resolve the problem with related orders. If the edit goes in, the CSR address and the address fields listed above on the LSR, will be compared for accuracy, then the address will be validated as a PREMIS valid address.

AT&T also expressed concern regarding the edits to go in with the 4/29 release would not resolve the problem. Birch commented that it sees a lot of discrepancy between the CSR and PREMIS. SBC stated that the significant problem is that incorrect addresses on the LSRs are received. The majority of the addresses in CRIS and PREMIS are correct. CRIS is the only database that maintains addresses with working telephone numbers for both Residence and Business service.

Birch vehemently opposed implementation of this edit. AT&T also had serious concerns with the implementation. They believe that it will cause more CLEC problems than it resolves. There was more discussion on the possibility of alternative solutions/options, and the problems associated with this edit. SBC agreed to research other possibilities and report back its findings at another meeting. It was ultimately decided to table this issue to give CLECs an opportunity to review the Accessible Letter regarding the April 29<sup>th</sup> release and for SBC to investigate additional options. Agreement was reached to continue this discussion on February 3, at 8:30 a.m. CST.

**ACTION ITEM:** SBC will make necessary conference bridge arrangements and send out the information via Accessible Letter.

Birch requested that this issue be included as an agenda item for the next scheduled Change Management Process meeting scheduled for February 8<sup>th</sup>.

**ACTION ITEM:** SBC will add the discussion of the address validation edit scheduled for the 4/29 release to the 2/8 Change Management Process meeting agenda.

**Facilities:**

Conversion Activity With the Addition of New Service

The problem occurs when orders are submitted with a conversion and new service on the same service order and the new service must be CF'd because there are no facilities.

Short Term: The LSC has been provided with procedures to issue a separate service order for new line activity. A question was raised whether CLECs can request transmission on multiplexar facilities. SBC stated that it would have to check into this question and would provide an answer back to the CLEC.

**ACTION ITEM:** SBC will check into the capability to receive transmission levels for UNE-P on multiplexar facilities and provide a response.

Long Term: A separate mechanized C order will be issued (with 4/29 Release) for new line activity (with dispatch) in addition to the C order for the conversion activity. The FOC will provide both order numbers. The CLEC will receive a single SOC when both C orders are completed.

Birch stated that the Accessible Letter did not mention the fact that when there is a conversion order with new activity, that SBC will automatically create two new service orders. SBC responded that although it would create two orders internally, the CLEC will receive a single FOC so there would be no CLEC impact. Birch stated that it would like to have this type of information included in the notifications. Birch tracks all service

orders, so this does impact them. Birch requested that SBC add this issue as an agenda item for the next Change Management Process meeting scheduled for February 8<sup>th</sup>.

**ACTION ITEM:** SBC will add the discussion of the creation of two service orders to the 2/8 Change Management Process meeting agenda.

#### Charter Number Service

Long Term: Mechanized flow-through will be implemented with the April 29 release. SBC explained the ordering requirements and new conditions, which are outlined in Accessible Letter CLEC99-195, distributed on December 30, 1999.

AT&T asked if in the future, Accessible Letters could be distributed sufficiently in advance of the meeting at which the particular topic would be discussed. This would allow CLECs time to review the content of the letter and discuss the information with their internal SMEs prior to the meeting. SBC responded that there are a number of different groups within SBC who send out Accessible Letters on various topics, and it would be very difficult to control/coordinate the distribution of the Letters. Also, SBC would not want to hold up the distribution of a particular Letter because there would not be sufficient time for CLECs to review the Letter prior to a meeting. However, SBC stated that it would make every effort to coordinate the timing of the distribution of Accessible Letters addressing those topics in which an upcoming CLEC User Forum meeting is scheduled, and the actual meeting.

#### **CLEC USER FORUM GUIDELINES**

MCI Worldcom gave an overview of the draft CLEC User Forum Guidelines, which was distributed with the meeting notice (Accessible Letter CLEC00-017). A copy of the Guidelines is included as Attachment 5 to these minutes.

The Guidelines were developed by the CLEC User Forum Proposal Team, consisting of CLEC volunteers and SBC. The Proposal Team felt the structure of the CLEC User Forum should consist of two-tiers: 1) an Executive Steering Committee and 2) the general CLEC Forum. The focus of the CLEC User Forum would be to address business/manual processes, network operations, ordering and provisioning, maintenance and repair, etc. The User Forum is not intended to serve as a Regulatory Forum.

A question was raised regarding the appropriateness of bringing an example of a CLEC owned switch and ported phone numbers before the CLEC User Forum and the process by which this issue would be resolved. Discussion following the process outlined in the Guidelines ensued. During the discussion, it was pointed out that the CLEC User Forum should not be used to circumvent the established Account Management process and other problem resolution processes.

AT&T proposed that updates to the CLEC Handbook go through the CLEC User Forum. SBC responded that there are a number of different sections in the Handbook, each of which may be "owned" by different internal departments that maintain control and responsibility for its accuracy. It would be an enormous undertaking for the CLEC User Forum to serve as a gateway for all changes/updates to the Handbook. SBC suggested

that it would be willing to pursue separating out the business processes and manual process vs. other sections.

**ACTION ITEM:** SBC will investigate the possibility of having updates/changes to the business process and manual process sections of the Handbook filter through the CLEC User Forum.

There was discussion on the need to get input from a wider representation of the CLEC community on the Guidelines than that participating on the conference call at this meeting. The desire is to baseline the document so it can be implemented as soon as possible. There was consensus that the Guidelines should be re-distributed via an Accessible Letter. The Accessible Letter would state that the attached Guidelines will be baselined and rolled out effective April 1<sup>st</sup>. The Letter would request CLECs to review the document and provide feedback and comments prior to the planned implementation.

There was discussion on the best way to get the feedback from the CLECs; whether it should be via conference call or a face-to-face meeting. The consensus was that there should be a face-to-face meeting to walk-through the document. Agreement was reached that the walk-through should be held in conjunction with the next CLEC User Forum. Since this is a SWBT region CLEC User Forum, the meeting would be held in Dallas, Texas. It was agreed that the next meeting will be a face-to-face in Dallas, Texas on February 24, 2000, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. CST. SBC agreed to make necessary arrangements for this meeting and provide the information via Accessible Letter.

**ACTION ITEM:** SBC will make necessary conference room and bridge arrangements and send out logistics via Accessible Letter.

The Action Item Log is updated and included as Attachment 6 to these minutes.

The conference call was adjourned at 12:00 p.m. CST